## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

```
W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his )
capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and )
OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE )
ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT, )
in his capacity as the )
TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES)
FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )

Plaintiff, )

vs. )4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ

TYSON FOODS, INC., et al, )

Defendants. )
```

VOLUME I OF THE VIDEOTAPED

DEPOSITION OF FRANK COALE, PhD, produced as a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above styled and numbered cause, taken on the 15th day of January, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly certified under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oklahoma.

A P P E A R A N C E S  OR THE PLAINTIFFS: Mr. Robert Nance Attorney at Law 502 West 6th Street Tulsa, OK 74119 -and- Mr. Trevor Hammons Asst. Attorney General 313 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105  OR CARGILL: Ms. Theresa Hill Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103  OR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  OR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700 Tulsa, OK 74103	(Whereupon, the deposition began at 9:04 a.m.)  VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the Record for the deposition of Dr. Frank Coale. Today is January 15th, 2009. The time is 9:05 a.m. Would counsel please identify themselves for the Record?  MR. NANCE: Bob Nance for the State of Oklahoma.  MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma.  MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma.  MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc.  MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants.  09:04AM  MR. ELROD: John Elrod for Simmons.	09:04AM
Attorney at Law 502 West 6th Street Tulsa, OK 74119 -and- Mr. Trevor Hammons Asst. Attorney General 313 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105 OR CARGILL: Ms. Theresa Hill Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103 OR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701 OR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the Record for the deposition of Dr. Frank Coale. Today is January 15th, 2009. The time is 9:05 a.m. Would counsel please identify themselves for the Record?  MR. NANCE: Bob Nance for the State of Oklahoma.  MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma.  09:04AM  MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma.  MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc.  MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants.	
Attorney at Law 502 West 6th Street Tulsa, OK 74119 -and- Mr. Trevor Hammons Asst. Attorney General 313 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105 OR CARGILL: Ms. Theresa Hill Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103 OR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701 OR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	the deposition of Dr. Frank Coale. Today is January 15th, 2009. The time is 9:05 a.m. Would counsel please identify themselves for the Record?  MR. NANCE: Bob Nance for the State of Oklahoma.  MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma.  09:04AM  MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma.  MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc.  MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
Tulsa, OK 74119 -andand- Mr. Trevor Hammons Asst. Attorney General 313 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105  PR CARGILL: Ms. Theresa Hill Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103  PR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  PR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	the deposition of Dr. Frank Coale. Today is January 15th, 2009. The time is 9:05 a.m. Would counsel please identify themselves for the Record?  MR. NANCE: Bob Nance for the State of Oklahoma.  MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma.  09:04AM  MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma.  MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc.  MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
-and- Mr. Trevor Hammons Asst. Attorney General 313 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105  PR CARGILL: Ms. Theresa Hill Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103  PR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  PR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	15th, 2009. The time is 9:05 a.m. Would counsel please identify themselves for the Record?  MR. NANCE: Bob Nance for the State of Oklahoma.  MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma.  09:04AM  MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma.  MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc.  MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants.  09:04AM	09:04AM
Asst. Attorney General 313 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105  OR CARGILL: Ms. Theresa Hill Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103  OR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  OR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	please identify themselves for the Record?  MR. NANCE: Bob Nance for the State of Oklahoma.  MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma.  O9:04AM  MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma.  MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc.  MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants.  09:04AM	09:04AM
313 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105  OR CARGILL: Ms. Theresa Hill Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103  OR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  OR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	MR. NANCE: Bob Nance for the State of Oklahoma. MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma. 09:04AM MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma. MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc. MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  OR CARGILL: Ms. Theresa Hill Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103  OR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  OR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	Oklahoma.  MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma.  09:04AM  MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma.  MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson  Farms, Inc.  MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants.  09:04AM	
Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103  PR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  PR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma. 09:04AM MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma. MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc. MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
Attorney at Law 100 West 5th Street Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103  PR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  PR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	MR. HAMMONS: Trevor Hammons for the State of Oklahoma. 09:04AM MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma. MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc. MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103  PR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  PR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	of Oklahoma. 09:04AM  MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma.  MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson  Farms, Inc.  MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
Tulsa, OK 74103  PR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  PR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	MR. HAMMONS: For the State of Oklahoma.  MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson  Farms, Inc.  MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants.  09:04AM	
PR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701 PR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson Farms, Inc. MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
Attorney at Law 211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  PR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	Farms, Inc. MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
211 East Dickson Street Fayetteville, AR 72701  R PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	Farms, Inc. MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
Fayetteville, AR 72701  OR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Attorney at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	MS. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's defendants. 09:04AM	
Attomey at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700	defendants. 09:04AM	
Attomey at Law 320 South Boston Suite 700		
320 South Boston Suite 700	MR. ELROD: John Elrod for Simmons.	
ruisa, Or /TIO	MC UII I. Thomas Hill for Cill I	
	MS. HILL: Theresa Hill for Cargill, Inc.,	
R GEORGE'S: Ms. K. C. Tucker	Cargill Turkey Production, LLC.	
	VIDEOGRAPHER: And on the phone?	
Fayetteville, AR 72701	MR. SANDERS: Bob Sanders for the Cal-Maine	09:04AI
		0,.01111
2000 AmSouth Plaza	VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. The witness may	
P. O. Box 23059	be sworn in.	
	FRANK COALE. PhD	
( ,	i i	
0		
Z	4	
	the whole truth and nothing but the truth testified	
INDEV		
INDEX		
	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
TITMESS DAGE	BY MR. NANCE:	
TINESS	O Dr. Coale, would you state your name for the	09:05AN
DANIZ COALE DED		
KANK COALE, PIID	1	
Direct Franciscotics by Mr. Norse		
Direct Examination by Mr. Nance 3	Q And how are you employed, sir?	
252	A I'm a professor at the University of Maryland.	
	And what is it you teach at the University of	09:05AM
eporter's Certificate 253		U).USAMI
	A I'm a soil scientist, and most recently I've	
	been teaching environmental science courses.	
	O This is your first deposition in this case:	
	1	
	Q Ever?	
	A Yes.	
		00.05435
		09:05AM
	case; is that right?	
	A Yes.	
	A Yes, I have. 09:05AM	
2	_	
or R	Attorney at Law 221 North College Fayetteville, AR 72701  R CAL-MAINE: Mr. Robert Sanders Attorney at Law 2000 AmSouth Plaza	Attorney at Law 221 North College Fayetteville, AR Z701  R CAL-MAINE: Mr. Robert Sanders Attorney at Law 2000 AmSouth Flaza P. O. Box 2309 Jackson, MS 39225 (Via phone)  I N D E X  I N D

1	Q Are you satisfied with the testimony you gave?	Q Do they have any presence do these
2	A Yes.	defendants have any presence in the Delmarva
3	Q Okay. How long have you been at the	Peninsula?
4	University of Maryland?	A Not that I know of.
5	A Fifteen years. 09:05AM	Q Okay. Then that brings us to this case. When 09:08AM
6	Q Okay. Have you had occasion to be involved in	was it you were approached about being involved in
7	the study of agriculture on the Delmarva Peninsula?	this case?
8	A Yes, I have.	A It was November or December of 2006.
9	Q Give me the 30,000-foot overview of that.	Q And who approached you, sir?
10	A The 30,000-foot overview of my work has been 09:06AM	A I believe the initial phone call came from Mr. 09:08AM
11	looking at agronomic soil fertility issues, nutrient	Webster.
12	management issues, the interface between	Q I don't know Mr. Webster. Who does he work
13	agricultural production and water quality concerns.	for?
14	Q Okay. What is the relationship between	A That's a very good question. We met at an
15	agricultural production and water quality concerns 09:06AM	office of Sidley Austin in Washington, D.C. I 09:08AM
16	in the Delmarva Peninsula?	presume.
17	A Well, the goal is to manage nutrients on the	Q Is he a lawyer at Sidley Austin?
18	farm so that the farm has the soil has enough	A I think so. My guess would be yes.
19	nutrients in it to produce maximum crop production	Q Tell me about that meeting at Sidley Austin.
20	that the farmer whatever crop the farmer is 09:06AM	A They asked if I could come meet with them to 09:09AM
21	growing and yet try to minimize the loss from that	talk about nutrient management issues in general and
22 23	farmland of nutrients into surrounding water bodies.	agricultural and nutrient issues. At that time I
24	Q Is there a water quality problem in the	didn't know where things were going. I didn't have any background information. We met for several
25	Delmarva Peninsula caused in part by agricultural production? 09:06AM	hours and my what I remember about it was, I 09:09AM
29	6	8
1	A Water quality problem surrounding the Delmarva	think they were basically trying to see whether my
2	Peninsula?	expertise had some relationship with the case they
3	Q Right.	were working on developing.
4	A You know, the Chesapeake Bay is a focus area,	Q Did you meet with anyone besides Mr. Webster?
5	which that area is there's a lot of agricultural 09:07AM	A I believe at that meeting was a Mr. 09:09AM
6	land around that area, and the waters of Chesapeake	Fitzgerald.
7	Bay are enriched with nutrients above levels that	Q Okay.
8	the water quality specialists think they should be.	A And Tim Jones. There were one or two other
9	Q Okay.	people present but I don't remember their names.
10 11	A And so there's a relation because of landscape 09:07AM proximity.	Q Who does Tim Jones represent, if you know? 09:10AM
12	^	A He works for Tyson.  Q Okay. What kind of questions did they ask you
13	Q Okay. When in your career did you first have any discussion with any employee of the defendants	in that meeting?
14	in this case about those kind of issues, meaning	A It was very general. What's my experience
15	agriculture and water quality issues? 09:07AM	with nitrogen, phosphorus, other nutrients used in 09:10AM
16	A In this case?	agricultural production systems, what's my
17	Q They're probably listed on the caption if you	experience with how those nutrients move through the
18	need to look.	landscape and what's the impact on water bodies of
19	A The first my first knowledge of this case	nutrients that may or may not flow from the
20	was it was November or December of 2006. 09:07AM	landscape into the water body. I felt they were 09:10AM
21	Q Okay. Perhaps I wasn't clear. Look at the	just trying to assess what my areas of expertise
22	caption and see who the defendants are in this case.	were. There were some areas, of course, during the
23	Have you dealt with any of their employees in the	course of the discussion where I didn't really have
24	Delmarva Peninsula prior to 2006 or 2007?	much to offer to the questions they were asking.
25	A I don't believe so. 09:08AM	Q Did you get any sort of assignment or 09:10AM
	7	9
	·	

1	engagement at the end of that meeting?	know. We've done these classes many times, and	
2	A No, I didn't. As a matter of fact, it was	there's various audiences, and I don't have a roster	
3	probably a year later before I heard anything else	of attendees.	
4	from them.	Q Was there anything in your preparation for the	
5	Q When did you next hear anything from them? 09:11AM	preliminary injunction hearing, as you looked at	09:13AM
6	A It was a year later, probably December of '07.	studies or whatever, that you didn't already know in	
7	Q What happened in December of '07 pertinent to	a general sense; did you learn anything?	
8	this case?	A Basically I had a general understanding of	
9	A Again, I believe it was Mr. Webster contacted	what we covered before the preliminary injunction	
10	me and told me about the preliminary injunction 09:11AM	hearing. 09:14AM	
11	hearing that was coming up, and he kind of explained	Q Have you been involved in the adoption of the	
12	to me where they were going with that, and I didn't	Maryland phosphorus index?	
13	know anything about it at the time, and offered	A Yes, I have.	
14	asked me if I would be interested in offering my	Q What was your involvement in that, sir?	
15	expertise in trying to understand some of the 09:11AM	A Well, I was one of the individuals who	09:14AM
16	phosphorus index issues and soil phosphorus issues	developed we call it the Maryland phosphorus site	
17	that would be involved in that hearing.	index. Just a little different terminology; means	
18	Q What did you say?	the same thing. I was involved in the development	
19	A I said, sure, yes.	of that and publication of writing the	
20	Q What did you do to prepare to testify in the 09:11AM	publications to describe how to manage it and use it	09:14AM
21	preliminary injunction hearing?	in the field, and as we talked about earlier, I've	
22	A There were I'm trying to remember what came	been involved with holding training sessions for	
23	at what point in time. Most of it was I reviewed	individuals who want to become trained in how to use	
24	work on phosphorus index principles, development and	it.	
25	application to understand how that would apply to 09:12AM	Q Since your testimony in the preliminary	09:14AM
	10	12	
1	the purpose of that hearing.	injunction hearing, what have you done to get ready	
2	Q Do you teach classes at the University of	to testify at trial?	
2	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices?	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that	
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q Do you teach classes at the University of</li> <li>Maryland on phosphorus indices?</li> <li>A Teach extension education classes, not</li> </ul>	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several	00.15 A.M
2 3 4 5	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in	09:15AM
2 3 4 5 6	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. Q What do you mean when you say extension	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.	09:15AM
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes.  Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes?	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be	09:15AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes.  Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university,	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's	09:15AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are 09:12AM	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we	09:15AM 09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are individuals in the community who are dealing with	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.	09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices?  A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes.  Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes?  A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of  09:13AM	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices?  A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes.  Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes?  A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of student on phosphorus index.	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it, and if I forget it, I'll count on Lisa to do it.	09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of student on phosphorus index. Q Have representatives of any of the poultry	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it, and if I forget it, I'll count on Lisa to do it.  Q Is that a copy of your declaration in this	09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices?  A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes.  Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes?  A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of student on phosphorus index.	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it, and if I forget it, I'll count on Lisa to do it.	09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes.  Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of student on phosphorus index. Q Have representatives of any of the poultry integrators attended any of those classes?	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it, and if I forget it, I'll count on Lisa to do it.  Q Is that a copy of your declaration in this case?  A Yes, looks like it is.	09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are 09:12AM individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of 09:13AM student on phosphorus index. Q Have representatives of any of the poultry integrators attended any of those classes? MR. McDANIEL: Bob, you mean the defendants	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it, and if I forget it, I'll count on Lisa to do it.  Q Is that a copy of your declaration in this case?	09:16AM 09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are 09:12AM individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of 09:13AM student on phosphorus index. Q Have representatives of any of the poultry integrators attended any of those classes?  MR. McDANIEL: Bob, you mean the defendants in this case? 09:13AM	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it, and if I forget it, I'll count on Lisa to do it.  Q Is that a copy of your declaration in this case?  A Yes, looks like it is.  Q Okay. I notice you brought in a copy with	09:16AM 09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are 09:12AM individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of 09:13AM student on phosphorus index. Q Have representatives of any of the poultry integrators attended any of those classes?  MR. McDANIEL: Bob, you mean the defendants in this case? 09:13AM MR. NANCE: The defendants in this case.	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it, and if I forget it, I'll count on Lisa to do it.  Q Is that a copy of your declaration in this case?  A Yes, looks like it is.  Q Okay. I notice you brought in a copy with you. Did you bring in a copy of the same thing?	09:16AM 09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Do you teach classes at the University of Maryland on phosphorus indices? A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes? A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are 09:12AM individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of 09:13AM student on phosphorus index. Q Have representatives of any of the poultry integrators attended any of those classes?  MR. McDANIEL: Bob, you mean the defendants in this case? 09:13AM MR. NANCE: The defendants in this case. A Not that I know of.	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it, and if I forget it, I'll count on Lisa to do it.  Q Is that a copy of your declaration in this case?  A Yes, looks like it is.  Q Okay. I notice you brought in a copy with you. Did you bring in a copy of the same thing?  A Yes. It looks like it's identical to the one	09:16AM 09:16AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Maryland on phosphorus indices?  A Teach extension education classes, not undergraduate classroom on-campus type classes. 09:12AM  Q What do you mean when you say extension education classes?  A Well, part of our role at the university, being a land grant university, is to offer education to the public, and for this mission, our public are 09:12AM individuals in the community who are dealing with agricultural and nutrient issues, whether it be farmers or consultants or advisors or state agency personnel, federal agency personnel. So we've taught many training classes for that population of 09:13AM student on phosphorus index.  Q Have representatives of any of the poultry integrators attended any of those classes?  MR. McDANIEL: Bob, you mean the defendants in this case? 09:13AM  MR. NANCE: The defendants in this case.  A Not that I know of.  Q Have representatives of any poultry industry	to testify at trial?  A Prepared this declaration, this report that was submitted, and in there it indicates several documents I reviewed, considered and included in some cases to back up my opinions up in here.  Q Let me hand you a document you will be familiar with, and I will mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1. Pardon me. Hang on just a minute.  MR. McDANIEL: Is it okay with you if we mark the bottom of the stickers Coale?  MR. NANCE: Not at all.  MR. McDANIEL: And either you can do it or Lisa can do it. Thank you.  MR. NANCE: I'll try to remember to do it, and if I forget it, I'll count on Lisa to do it.  Q Is that a copy of your declaration in this case?  A Yes, looks like it is.  Q Okay. I notice you brought in a copy with you. Did you bring in a copy of the same thing?  A Yes. It looks like it's identical to the one I brought with me.	09:16AM 09:16AM

ľ		
1	testify today?	necessarily true.
2	A Yesterday I sat down with Mr. McDaniel and his	Q You say in Paragraph B, which is the next
3	colleague, and this being my first deposition, they	paragraph down, the second sentence, in most
4	kind of walked me through how it would work and what	agricultural field production situations, sufficient
5	to expect, and then we walked through my declaration 09:17AM	quantities of micronutrients are available as a 09:19AM
6	and made sure I was comfortable with everything that	result of organic matter, decomposition and mineral
7	was in there and we walked through some other, the	weathering in the soil. Apart from the contribution
8	transcript from the PI testimony and made sure I was	of litter, would that be true generally of the soils
9	comfortable with that.	in the Illinois River watershed?
10	Q Okay, and are you comfortable with Plaintiff's 09:17AM	A I don't think I'm qualified to speak 09:20AM
11	Exhibit 1, which is your declaration?	specifically about micronutrients in the Illinois
12	A Yes, I am.	River watershed soils. I just haven't studied them.
13	Q Let's, if we could, Dr. Coale, turn to Page 3	Q And if I say IRW, can we understand that I
14	of that declaration and look at the very top of the	mean Illinois River watershed?
15	page. I believe that is Paragraph 3A of the 09:17AM	A Yes, sir. 09:20AM
16	declaration.	Q Okay. Let's turn to the page and look at
17	A Uh-huh.	Subparagraph H, Dr. Coale. You say in the first
18	Q You have a sentence, and I'm just going to	line of that subparagraph that poultry litter is a
19	read it and then just ask you what it means, okay,	heterogeneous mixture of various things. What do
20	if I could. It's the very top sentence. Contrary 09:17AM	you mean when you say heterogeneous mixture? 09:20AM
21	to a statement presented in Section 4A of Dr. Gordon	MR. McDANIEL: You did paraphrase his words
22	Johnson's expert report, and then it cites to the	when you said various things?
23	report, it is incorrect to categorically equate the	MR. NANCE: I did, yeah.
24	relative quantity of each essential plant nutrient	MR. McDANIEL: Go ahead.
25	required by plants and the frequency of deficiency 09:18AM	A Heterogeneous mixture means it's not uniformly 09:21AM
	14	16
1	of any specific nutrient in soils. Did I read that	mixed. It's not homogenous. It's it's a mixture
2	correctly?	that's not uniform across top to bottom, east to
3	A Yes, you did.	west, north to south.
4	Q Okay. What did you mean in that sentence?	Q Later on about six lines down you give an
5	A Simply I mean it's incorrect to assume that 09:18AM	example or you are talking about litter. It says 09:21AM
6	simply because a crop needs a larger quantity of a	I'll read the sentence and then we'll talk about it.
7	particular nutrient, that the potential to have a	For example, N is not separated from the P and the P
8	deficiency for that nutrient is higher than the	is not separated from the K. Did I read that
9	potential for having a deficiency of a nutrient	correctly?
10	where the crop needs a smaller or less quantity of 09:18AM	A Yes, you did. 09:21AM
11	that nutrient for its growth.	Q And if we talk about N, are we talking about
12	Q Let me give you a for instance and see if I'm	nitrogen?
13	getting what you're saying. Plants need more	A Yes.
14	nitrogen than they do zinc; is that correct?	Q And P is phosphorus?
15	A That's correct. 09:19AM	A Yes. 09:21AM
16	Q But is your point here that it would be	Q And K is potassium?
17	incorrect to say that it's more likely you're short	A Yes, it is.
18	of nitrogen than zinc just because it needs more?	Q Okay. So do I understand correctly that in
19	A Well, from a soil fertility, that's a very	poultry litter, you can't separate the nitrogen from
20	difficult example you gave because zinc and nitrogen 09:19AM	the phosphorus and the phosphorus from the 09:21AM
21	are very, very, very different in how they behave,	potassium, for instance?
22	but in generality if you have a nutrient that you	A As it's managed on the farm?
23	need a large quantity of, in your example nitrogen,	Q Correct.
24	saying there's a higher probability of having a	A That's absolutely correct. You have to manage
25	nitrogen deficiency than a zinc deficiency isn't 09:19AM	it as a whole, as an entity of itself. 09:22AM
		The distribution of the di

1	Q Is there any way off the farm to separate	there's a variable range.
2	these particular constituents?	Q Okay, and do I remember correctly that the
3	A Oh, I'm sure it can be done, but I don't know	plant need for nitrogen is greater than the need for
4	how to do it.	phosphorus, and let's just talk forage crops like
5	Q Okay. It's not your area and you're not going 09:22AM	we're going to be dealing with in the IRW. 09:24AM
6	to offer any testimony on that?	A Forage grasses, not legumes. Forage grasses,
7	A No, I'm not.	yes, the primary demand would be for nitrogen. They
8	Q Okay. Then you say the next sentence is,	need a larger quantity of nitrogen in the forage
9	farm management decisions regarding utilization of	grass.
10	poultry litter nutrients must be based on the most 09:22AM	Q And if you meet the nitrogen need for forage 09:25AM
11	efficient and effective use of the single product	grasses with litter, you're going to over apply for
12	poultry litter. Did I read that right?	phosphorus as a general rule?
13	A Yes, you did.	A As a general rule, if you are applying litter
14	Q Okay. What did you mean by that sentence,	to a pasture to supply the pasture with the nitrogen
15	sir? 09:22AM	it needs for maximum productivity, whether or not 09:25AM
16	A When you're making farm management decisions	you're applying the right amount of phosphorus on it
17	about how to utilize the poultry litter that you	depends on the soil test level phosphorus excuse
18	have available on the farm, you can't break it up	me, soil test level phosphorus soils test level
19	into its component constituents of potassium or	of the soil is what I'm trying to say. So in some
20	phosphorus or nitrogen and put the potassium one 09:23AM	cases, yes; in some cases, no. 09:25AM
21	place and the phosphorus another place and nitrogen	Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing
22	another place. That goes along with being a	with here is that people have used litter to meet
23	heterogeneous mixture in a single entity. So you	their nitrogen need and over applied phosphorus?
24	make a decision about how you are going to utilize	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
25	it based on having to utilize the whole intact 09:23AM	A Do I continue? 09:25AM
	18	20
		1
1	product and not break it up into its constituents	O Vay can as about and answer the question
1	product and not break it up into its constituents.	Q You can go ahead and answer the question.  MR_McDANIEL: If you understand the
2	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the
<u>2</u> 3	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.
2 3 4	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got
2 3 4 5	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM
2 3 4 5 6	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there.  O9:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there.  O9:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus 09:24AM	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the 09:26AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus 09:24AM in litter is approximately one to one?	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the 09:26AM nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus 09:24AM in litter is approximately one to one?  A In very general terms, that may be the	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there.  O9:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  O9:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the o9:26AM nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given to what the phosphorus supplying the litter was.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus 09:24AM in litter is approximately one to one?  A In very general terms, that may be the ballpark it is in, but, of course, if you are trying	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given to what the phosphorus supplying the litter was.  Q The proposition I put forward in that question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus in litter is approximately one to one?  A In very general terms, that may be the ballpark it is in, but, of course, if you are trying to do the most efficient and effective management,	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given to what the phosphorus supplying the litter was.  Q The proposition I put forward in that question is not an alien one to you in your profession, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus in litter is approximately one to one?  A In very general terms, that may be the ballpark it is in, but, of course, if you are trying to do the most efficient and effective management, you have the litter analyzed so you know exactly 09:24AM	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there. 09:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 09:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given to what the phosphorus supplying the litter was.  Q The proposition I put forward in that question is not an alien one to you in your profession, is it? 09:26AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus in litter is approximately one to one?  A In very general terms, that may be the ballpark it is in, but, of course, if you are trying to do the most efficient and effective management, you have the litter analyzed so you know exactly 09:24AM what you are dealing with so you know the what	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there.  O9:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  O9:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given to what the phosphorus supplying the litter was.  Q The proposition I put forward in that question is not an alien one to you in your profession, is it?  O9:26AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus in litter is approximately one to one?  A In very general terms, that may be the ballpark it is in, but, of course, if you are trying to do the most efficient and effective management, you have the litter analyzed so you know exactly 09:24AM what you are dealing with so you know the what the pounds per ton of nitrogen, phosphorus,	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there.  O9:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  O9:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given to what the phosphorus supplying the litter was.  Q The proposition I put forward in that question is not an alien one to you in your profession, is it?  O9:26AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe it has happened in the past.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus in litter is approximately one to one?  A In very general terms, that may be the ballpark it is in, but, of course, if you are trying to do the most efficient and effective management, you have the litter analyzed so you know exactly 09:24AM what you are dealing with so you know the what the pounds per ton of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium are available from that litter, but to	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there.  O9:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  O9:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given to what the phosphorus supplying the litter was.  Q The proposition I put forward in that question is not an alien one to you in your profession, is it?  O9:26AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe it has happened in the past.  Q Okay. Are you suggesting it hasn't happened
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus in litter is approximately one to one?  A In very general terms, that may be the ballpark it is in, but, of course, if you are trying to do the most efficient and effective management, you have the litter analyzed so you know exactly 09:24AM what you are dealing with so you know the what the pounds per ton of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium are available from that litter, but to make an overall assumption, boil down all that data	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there.  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  O9:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given to what the phosphorus supplying the litter was.  Q The proposition I put forward in that question is not an alien one to you in your profession, is it?  O9:26AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe it has happened in the past.  Q Okay. Are you suggesting it hasn't happened in the Illinois River watershed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q What do you mean when you say it must be the most efficient use?  A Well, it's a valuable product, so you want to use it the most efficiently you can on the farm to 09:23AM help enhance crop growth, and you don't want to use it in a manner where you are not getting the most benefit from it on the farm, and that's what I mean by efficient.  Q What do you mean when you say you must get the 09:23AM most effective use?  A I'd say they would be synonymous with efficient.  Q Again, in very general terms, Dr. Coale, would it be true that the ratio of nitrogen to phosphorus in litter is approximately one to one?  A In very general terms, that may be the ballpark it is in, but, of course, if you are trying to do the most efficient and effective management, you have the litter analyzed so you know exactly 09:24AM what you are dealing with so you know the what the pounds per ton of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium are available from that litter, but to make an overall assumption, boil down all that data	MR. McDANIEL: If you understand the question, go ahead.  A Could you repeat the question, please? I got a little confused there.  O9:26AM  Q Historically part of the problem we're dealing with in this lawsuit is that people have used litter to meet the nitrogen need of the forage and have over and consequently over applied phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  O9:26AM  A Okay. I don't have firsthand knowledge of what farmers in the IRW did. I know, based on my firsthand experience of poultry litter utilization in other parts of the country, that in past years recommendations were to apply litter to supply the nitrogen needs of the crop without much regard given to what the phosphorus supplying the litter was.  Q The proposition I put forward in that question is not an alien one to you in your profession, is it?  O9:26AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe it has happened in the past.  Q Okay. Are you suggesting it hasn't happened in the Illinois River watershed?

1	Q Okay, but you haven't personally gone out and	can kind of come to an understanding. There are
2	seen what farmers have done in the Illinois River	some fields, for instance, which are simply
3	watershed?	inappropriate for the use of litter by virtue of
4	A That's correct.	their slope or the shallowness of their soil or the
5	Q Okay, but it's something the use of litter 09:27AM	rockiness or the prone proneness to flooding and 09:30AM
6	for nitrogen needs and the over application of	things like that; is that a fair statement?
7	phosphorus is something you're familiar with in your	A Yes. From both a practical and from a
8	professional work?	management point of view, yeah, you wouldn't want to
9	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	do that.
10	A In my professional work, in the past 09:27AM	Q Okay. Unless we say differently, can we 09:30AM
11	recommendations, I mean past decades ago, we were	assume that in our discussion today, we are talking
12	recommending applying litter based on the nitrogen	about fields where it's appropriate to apply litter?
13	needs of the crop, and I am aware of times when that	I'll ask you about pastures and applying litter, and
14	resulted in application of phosphorus more than the	let's just assume, can we, that we're talking about
15	crop would need by recommendation. 09:27AM	appropriate locations? 09:30AM
16	Q In your professional field, is that a common	MR. McDANIEL: Let me I object to the
17	understanding or is that something you're telling me	form of that question in asking that that be assumed
18	is just something that's happened in a few instances	throughout the deposition. Go ahead.
19	you know of?	A I would prefer that we specify as we go
20	A I think it happens fairly commonly. 09:28AM	through here because I want to be cautious I don't 09:31AM
21	Q Okay. Now, back to Subparagraph H there on	misspeak. So there are some I'd rather say where
22	Page 4	other restrictions don't limit litter application.
23	A H did you say?	I'd rather we specify as we go.
24	Q H, yes.	Q Okay. It's going to make for longer
25	A Okay. 09:28AM	questions. 09:31AM
	22	24
1	O What I'll and Albahard form and the	A Well. I want to make sure I understand where
1 2	Q Why did you talk about farm management decisions?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
3		we are going.
4	A Because as a reference to farm management decisions, based on utilizing the litter in a farm	Q All right.  MR. ELROD: You sure you've never given a
<del>1</del> 5	operation, litter is being produced on the farm. 09:28AM	
6	You utilize it on the farm to in its most	1
7	efficient manner. So that's part of the whole farm	A No, sir.  MR. NANCE: Pretty good first time out of
8	management is how to utilize it efficiently.	1
9		the box, isn't he?  MR. ELROD: Yeah.
10	Q If you were managing the whole watershed, would you still want to get the most efficient and 09:28AM	
11 12	effective use of litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	efficient and effective location to use litter where
13	A My understanding is that the litter would	there are other restrictions that don't apply is not on the farm where it's generated?
14	still be managed at the farm level, so my comments	A The problem is you may be able to utilize it
15	were based on managing litter at the farm level. 09:29AM	on a situation on a field where it's not the most 09:32AM
16	Q Would the most efficient and effective use of	efficient and effective, but it is an — the next
10		step down in efficiency and effectiveness, and so
17	l litter he at least as regards nitrogen and	step down in emercine and effectivelless, and so
17 18	litter be, at least as regards nitrogen and phosphorus, on the location that is otherwise	* ·
18	phosphorus, on the location that is otherwise	you're making a decision that it's still effective,
18 19	phosphorus, on the location that is otherwise appropriate for litter in terms of slope and the	you're making a decision that it's still effective, maybe not the ideal scenario, but it's still
18 19 20	phosphorus, on the location that is otherwise appropriate for litter in terms of slope and the soil and all of that, where there is a need for both 09:29AM	you're making a decision that it's still effective, maybe not the ideal scenario, but it's still effective, and it might be a reasonable place to 09:32AM
18 19 20 21	phosphorus, on the location that is otherwise appropriate for litter in terms of slope and the soil and all of that, where there is a need for both 09:29AM nitrogen and phosphorus?	you're making a decision that it's still effective, maybe not the ideal scenario, but it's still effective, and it might be a reasonable place to apply it.  09:32AM
18 19 20 21 22	phosphorus, on the location that is otherwise appropriate for litter in terms of slope and the soil and all of that, where there is a need for both nitrogen and phosphorus?  A The most efficient use of litter would be	you're making a decision that it's still effective, maybe not the ideal scenario, but it's still effective, and it might be a reasonable place to apply it.  Q But you say it must be managed?
18 19 20 21 22 23	phosphorus, on the location that is otherwise appropriate for litter in terms of slope and the soil and all of that, where there is a need for both nitrogen and phosphorus?  A The most efficient use of litter would be where there would be a need for both nitrogen and	you're making a decision that it's still effective, maybe not the ideal scenario, but it's still effective, and it might be a reasonable place to apply it.  Q But you say it must be managed? A Well
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	phosphorus, on the location that is otherwise appropriate for litter in terms of slope and the soil and all of that, where there is a need for both nitrogen and phosphorus?  A The most efficient use of litter would be where there would be a need for both nitrogen and phosphorus by the crop you are trying to grow.	you're making a decision that it's still effective, maybe not the ideal scenario, but it's still effective, and it might be a reasonable place to op:32AM apply it.  Q But you say it must be managed? A Well Q Must be based on the most efficient and
18 19 20 21 22 23	phosphorus, on the location that is otherwise appropriate for litter in terms of slope and the soil and all of that, where there is a need for both nitrogen and phosphorus?  A The most efficient use of litter would be where there would be a need for both nitrogen and	you're making a decision that it's still effective, maybe not the ideal scenario, but it's still effective, and it might be a reasonable place to apply it.  Q But you say it must be managed? A Well

1	A That is available. So the most efficient and	Q Is litter ever moved from one entire watershed
2	effective scenario that's available to that farmer.	to another entire watershed to improve water
3	That farmer might not have the panacea of the best	quality?
4	position to apply it, but within his options, we	A Yes.
5	recommend he assess his options and within his 09:33AM	Q And would you endorse that if you got the most 09:35AM
6	options, apply it in the best, most efficient and	efficient and effective use of the litter?
7	effective manner that he has available. Every farm	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
8	is different.	A The first step in making that evaluation is
9	Q Are you wedded in your professional work to	can it be used effectively locally on the property
10	the notion that the decision is going to be made by 09:33AM	where it was generated, and then if you can, you 09:35AM
11	a farmer?	come up with a management plan to try to make it be
12	A My role and job is to advise farmers to make	used effectively there. If that proves to be
13	the best decisions they can make.	impossible, then you look at the next step, which is
14	Q Do you ever advise people who manage	moving it somewhere else.
15	watersheds at a higher level than a farm? 09:33AM	Q And if you well, at what point I'm 09:36AM
16	A Yes.	puzzled because you say pretty categorically farm
17	Q Who are those people you advise?	management decisions regarding utilization of
18	A It can vary. State regulatory agencies,	poultry litter must be based on the most efficient
19	watershed groups.	and effective use of the single product, poultry
20	Q Give me an example of a watershed group you've 09:33AM	litter. Are you telling me that farmers are making 09:36AM
21	advised.	decisions that aren't the most efficient and
22	A The I forget the a tributary strategy	effective use of that litter?
23	team. In Maryland there's called tributary teams.	A No. I'm saying, like I mentioned before, most
24	There's groups of individuals, business	efficient and effective use based on the options
25	professionals, farmers, scientists, advisors who 09:34AM	they have available to them. Okay? On their own or 09:36AM
	26	28
1	work on certain segments of the watershed and come	leased or managed property, they may not have
2	up with plans how we should best manage this water,	they may have an option to utilize litter that's
3	their section of that watershed, and we advise those	just fine, it may be a very good utilization, but
4	people.	they may be in a situation where they don't, and if
5	Q Do those people ever move litter off a farm to 09:34AM	that's the case, then they would be looking for an 09:37AM
6	a place where it is used in the most efficient and	alternative utilization site, and that may be on
7	effective manner?	their farm, on an adjacent farm or there's an active
8	A Those people in those tributary strategy	manure transport program that's subsidized
9	groups don't move litter. They come up with plans.	talking about the state of Maryland now where
10	They don't move litter. I've worked with farmers 09:34AM	some states subsidizes transport. So if they decide 09:37AM
11	who do move litter from one field to another field	it's worth their while to have a third party ship it
12	or from one part of the watershed to another part of	to another farm who can utilize it efficiently, they
13	a watershed because they can't find an efficient way	may be worth from their business point of view,
14	to use it on their property.	that may be their best option.
15	Q Okay. Do you work with farmers who ever move 09:34AM	Q So in the real world where you practice 09:37AM
16	litter out of a watershed to another location where	A Uh-huh.
17	it may be most efficiently and effectively used?	Q farm management often doesn't get the most
18	A Yes.	efficient and effective use of litter in the sense
19	Q Is that an appropriate thing agronomically?	that the litter is put where there is a need for
20	A There's times when it is. 09:35AM	both nitrogen and phosphorus? 09:37AM
21	Q Is that an appropriate thing environmentally?	A Oftentimes litter is applied where there's not
22	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	both a need for nitrogen and phosphorus on that
23	A Moving litter from one subwatershed to another	field.
24	subwatershed is often done to help protect water	Q Okay. As a matter of your professional
25	quality. 09:35AM	opinion, would you believe that that would be true 09:38AM
	27	29

in the Illinois River watershed as well as in	journals and studies come across any reports where
Maryland?	STP levels in the IRW have been raised very high by
A I believe in some fields it would be and in	commercial fertilizer?
some fields it wouldn't be. I think it would be	A I'm not aware of that.
very site specific. 09:38AM	Q Are there any other mechanisms that might be 09:40AM
Q You've looked at the data on some of the STPs	at work in the IRW to create the high kind of STPs
in the Illinois River watershed, haven't you?	we see in some sites there?
A I have looked at some of that data.	A From what I've learned about management of
Q And do you dispute Dr. Johnson's opinion that	soils in the IRW, no, I can't think of any that
those elevated STPs are caused by over application 09:38A	
of phosphorus from litter?	Q Okay. Is there any circumstance, Dr. Coale,
A Again, I don't have any firsthand knowledge of	where you would be able to use litter, for instance,
that, but based on what I've been told about how	in a different watershed where it could be
what the production sequence and what agricultural	efficiently and effectively used, in the sense of
production in the IRW is like, then one, you know, 09:38Al	
possible scenario would be that there would be	maximize the economics of an out-of-watershed farm?
elevated phosphorus on some sites in the soil due to	A That would be a matter of if I'm maximizing
past litter applications.	economics, that would be a matter of what the cost
Q What are the other plausible ways that STP	of different sources of nutrients were for that farm
would get so high in this watershed? 09:39AM	that was out of the watershed. If it was more 09:42AM
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	financially efficient, cheaper for the farm that's
A Well, again, it's going to be a site-by-site	outside the watershed to transport litter from a
determination. It could have been fields where	different farm inside the watershed to satisfy the
commercial fertilizer has been over applied and a	crop they're growing outside the watershed, nitrogen
higher rate of P application, and then for a lesser 09:39AM	and phosphorus needs and use litter to do it, then 09:42AM
30	32
P application was needed and elevated the soil test P level.  Q Do farmers in Maryland typically pay for commercial fertilizer and drive the STP up that	it would be a good business decision for the farm outside the watershed. On the contrary, flip side of that would be that if the farm outside the watershed could purchase nitrogen fertilizer,
high? 09:39AM	commercial fertilizer or phosphorus from commercial 09:42AM
A I would not like to think it was typical, but	fertilizer from a fertilizer dealer to supply the
I know it has happened.	needs of his crop at a lower rate, a lower cost,
Q Okay. It would would it be fair to say	then it wouldn't be efficient.
that that would be an exception rather than a rule	Q Okay. Agronomically are we getting the best
as a mechanism for getting an extremely high STP? 09:39.	AM use of poultry litter if it's used on a pasture 09:43AM
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	where other restrictions don't apply and where there
A It really depends on now you brought up in	is a need for both nitrogen and phosphorus?
reference that question was in Maryland. It's very	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
different agricultural production systems. There	A Again, I'll go back to the decision the farmer
are some where it was standard practice to raise 09:40AM	
soil phosphorus levels extremely high with	Q I'm just talking agronomics at this point.
fertilizer additions over the years. That	It's just an agronomic question.
doesn't in my knowledge doesn't apply can't be	A General agronomics, if you can satisfy two
applied to situations in the IRW. Hopefully those	nutrients need of the crop, whether nitrogen or
practices have stopped now. 09:40AM	phosphorus nutrient need, with the application of a 09:43AM
	single material, poultry litter in this case, yes.
Q Are you personally aware of any instances in	( ) E
the IRW where commercial fertilizer has been	Q Environmentally is it better to apply poultry
the IRW where commercial fertilizer has been employed to drive the STP up very high?	litter on a pasture where other restrictions don't
the IRW where commercial fertilizer has been employed to drive the STP up very high?  A Personally, no.	litter on a pasture where other restrictions don't apply where there is a need for both nitrogen and
the IRW where commercial fertilizer has been employed to drive the STP up very high?	litter on a pasture where other restrictions don't apply where there is a need for both nitrogen and

1	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	being the STP levels.
2	A The potential environmental ramifications of	A Well, then you also mentioned about using the
3	applying litter on a pasture field is going to be	phosphorus index to assess the site.
4	extremely site specific, extremely dependent on the	Q I mean if and I did that, Doctor, because
5	conditions of that field and that application, that 09:44AM	you're hung up on site-specific assessments. 09:47AM
6	I don't think you can make a blanket statement	A Yes, I am.
7	saying yes or no. It's going to be depending on the	Q I'm telling you for the purpose of this
8	site.	question this is a hypothetical question. For
9	Q I'm talking about a site now where other	the purposes of this question, these fields are
10	restrictions don't apply. 09:44AM	identical in every respect except the STP level; one 09:47AM
11	A I understand that.	is 30, the other is 300.
12	Q Okay. Is it environmentally better to put	A Uh-huh.
13	litter where the STP is lower or environmentally	Q Which is the better environmental place to
14	better, all things being equal, where STP is higher?	apply the litter?
15	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 09:45AM	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 09:47AM
16	A Again, it's site specific. Some cases, some	A And we assess environmental risk using a tool
17	sites it wouldn't make any difference. In other	like a phosphorus index tool; correct?
	sites it wouldn't make any difference. In other sites it might make a difference. That risk to the	^ ^
18		Q If you want to, however you want to do it.
19	environment has to be assessed on the site-specific	A I would use the output from that assessment
20	basis. 09:45AM	tool to tell me which was the most environmentally 09:48AM
21	Q So you're not willing to say, all things being	sensitive site.
22	equal in sites where no other restrictions apply,	Q As between those two identical fields,
23	that it's environmentally better, two identical	different only in their STPs, what would any
24	fields, to place the litter on a site with low STP	phosphorus index you want to use say would be the
25	than high STP? 09:45AM	better place to put the litter? 09:48AM
	34	36
1	MR. McDANIEL: Objection. It's asked and	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
2	answered.	A I can't answer that because I have seen the
3	A Again, I think you have to assess each site,	phosphorus index used on soils that had elevated STP
4	and I think you can't make a blanket statement like	levels, which the outcome of the phosphorus index
5	that. 09:46AM	assessment said there was negligible environmental 09:48AM
6		impact, and I have seen the phosphorus site index,
7	Q Assume for purposes of my question you have assessed the site using any phosphorus index you	phosphorus index used on soils that had a much lower
8	want to use	soil STP level where the outcome of the phosphorus
9	A Uh-huh.	site index was the potential risk was higher. So
10		it really is a very difficult scenario that I don't 09:48AM
11	Q and they are identical, and they are sites 09:46AM where no other restrictions apply, the only	think I can give you a straight answer to other than
12	difference between the two sites is one has an STP	to follow the recommendation of the output of a
13	of 30 and the other has an STP of 300.	phosphorus index assessment on that site.
14	A Okay.	Q You realize we're doing a mental experiment
15	Q Which is the better environmental application? 09:46AM	here? I mean, do you understand that's what we're 09:49AM
16	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	doing?
17	A The goal of a phosphorus index assessment, a	MR. ELROD: Doing what?
18	general overall goal is to be instructive. So when	A I don't understand what that means.
19	you do the assessment, it advises the assessor of a	MR. McDANIEL: What I understand we are
20	relative risk for phosphorus loss. So if everything 09:46AM	doing is asking very grossly broad hypotheticals, 09:49AM
21	else is equal and the relative risk outcome as	but you can characterize it as you wish. Go ahead.
22	predicted by the phosphorus index tool is equal,	Q You and I are doing a mental experiment here,
23	then the risk is equal.	okay, and I'm not asking about any field that you've
24	Q Well, I didn't say the assessments were equal.	ever looked at in the real world.
25	I said the fields were the same, the only difference 09:47AM	A Uh-huh.
		21 Un 11dH.
	35	37

1	Q I'm asking about two fields that are	contributing factor to the overall assessment.
2	completely identical	Q So you're telling me two fields with identical
3	A Okay.	erosion factors would result in the same rating even
4	Q in every respect except the STPs of the	if the STP level was 100 times?
5	soil. 09:49AM	A They may. 09:52AM
6	A Right.	Q How often does that happen in the real world?
7	Q Let's break it down in smaller bytes. The	A You offered a hypothetical, and I was trying
8	Maryland phosphorus site index	to see if I could think of on the spot where the
9	A Uh-huh.	hypothetical would not be true, and that's I
10	Q two identical fields 09:49AM	offered that case where this may be a case that's 09:52AM
11	A Uh-huh.	not true. So I don't want to categorically say that
12	Q different only in their STPs?	it's always true.
13	A Correct.	Q Okay, but for the counter hypothetical you've
14	Q How would the Maryland site index rate the	given me, would my hypothetical be true, that you
15	risk of phosphorus loss between the low field and 09:50AM	would get a higher risk from a higher STP in these 09:53AM
16	the high field?	two identical fields where there are no other
17	A Numerically the output from the phosphorus	limiting factors?
18	site index would rate the field that had a higher	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's
19	soil test level at a higher numerical risk than the	been asked and answered multiple times.
20	lower STP field, but that doesn't mean once you have 09:50AM	A Not categorically all the time because I can 09:53AM
21	a higher once the numerical number is calculated,	think of situations where it wouldn't happen.
22	you evaluate that by how it falls into broad	Q Other than the erosion situation, where would
23	categories of risk. That numerical output may be	it not happen?
24	numerically higher, but it doesn't necessarily mean	MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.
25	it's bounced into the next higher category of risk. 09:50AM 38	A That's the most logical scenario I can think 09:53AM 40
1	Q So there are categories in your phosphorus	of right now. I can't think of another one.
2	site index as well as a numerical rating?	Q Okay. Dr. Coale, if cost were not a factor,
3	A Correct.	would it be agronomically best to use litter on that
4	Q Let's make it a little easier. Same two	field where both nitrogen and phosphorus are needed
5	identical fields, no other restriction applied. The 09:50AM	and there are no other limiting factors? 09:54AM
6	STP on one is 30 and the STP on the other is 3,000.	MR. McDANIEL: Cost to whom?
7	A Okay.	MR. NANCE: To the farmer.
8	Q Would there be any different output in terms	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
9	of the broad categories your Maryland site index	A I'm trying to think of a scenario where cost
10	uses? 09:51AM	is not a factor. That's always a factor. 09:55AM
11	A The bottom line is I don't know. Let me give	Q Okay. Here's the scenario: Federal court
12	you an example. Can I do that?	says the defendants pay to transfer it. The farmer
13	Q Please.	is out no money.
14	A Okay. If these two identical sites had a	A Okay.
15	severely high erosion potential, okay, then the risk 09:51AM	MR. McDANIEL: Wait a minute. Finish your 09:55AM
16	may be extremely high for phosphorus losses on both	question, Bob, so there's a clear Record of what the
17	of them simply due to the erosion factor, which	question is.
18	has which would totally overwhelm the importance	Q Here's the question: In a circumstance in
19	of the soil test P level. So you got to be really	which the defendants are ordered by the court to pay
20	careful when you're that's why these assessment 09:52AM	for the transfer of the litter 09:55AM
21	techniques are built with many different factors in	A Uh-huh.  Q so the farmer doesn't bear the cost of
22 23	them because there can be a single factor that	Q so the farmer doesn't bear the cost of transport we'll break it down is it
<b>4</b> 5 24	override all the others, in this case maybe erosion.  There may be other factors which override the other	agronomically better to use the litter on a field
25	ones. STP level is not always the dominant 09:52AM	where both nitrogen and phosphorus are needed and 09:55AM
ده	·	
	39	41

1	there are no other factors that limit the use of	somewhere else and apply it, and that was a scenario
2	litter there?	where the assessment was made that there wasn't a
3	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	high risk for phosphorus loss.
4	A Okay, and so I get the terminology right, I'm	Q And under those circumstances, you're willing
5	assuming when you say defendants, you mean the 09:55AM	to give up your categorical statement that farm 09:59AM
6	defendants in this case; is that	management decisions regarding utilization of
7	Q That's my question, yes.	poultry litter nutrients must be based on the most
8	A Okay. If there's no financial burden on the	efficient and effective use of the single product?
9	farmer	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's
10	Q Right. 09:56AM	argumentative. 09:59AM
11	A and he's assessed his property and he	A What I'm saying is for that scenario, that is
12	doesn't have a very efficient utilization scheme on	his most efficient and effective use that he has
13	his property and it doesn't cost him anything to	available.
14	have that litter transported somewhere else and he	Q But it's not the most efficient and effective
15	doesn't need it agronomically on his property, then, 09:56AM	use of the litter because he doesn't need phosphorus 09:59AM
16	yes, that could work out agronomically.	on his soil?
17	Q Okay. Same question we'll look at it from	A In that scenario he doesn't need phosphorus on
18	a little different angle. Suppose the court orders	his soil, correct.
19	the defendants to pay for the transport and there is	MR. NANCE: We've got a five-minute
20	a field that is has otherwise no restrictions on 09:56AM	warning. Let's take a quick break and let him 09:59AM
21	use of litter and it has a need for both nitrogen	change tapes.
22	and phosphorus	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now off the Record and
23	A Uh-huh.	it's 10:01 a.m.
24	Q and the farm where it's being produced has	(Following a short recess at 9:59
25	high phosphorus. 09:57AM	a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:15
	42	44
1	A Okay.	a.m.)
1 2	A Okay.  Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the	a.m.)  VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.
	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?	[
2 3 4	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape,
2 3 4 5	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.
2 3 4 5 6	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on 09:57AM his farm. Where the litter originates still is	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to
2 3 4 5	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on 09:57AM his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the 10:15AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can 09:57AM	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for 09:58AM	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for that forage.	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for that forage.  Q So the status quo would remain; he would still	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?  A Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that — on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for that forage.  Q So the status quo would remain; he would still be using it where it was being produced even though	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?  A Okay.  Q So the farmer that owns that field is having
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for that forage.  Q So the status quo would remain; he would still be using it where it was being produced even though there's a need for it most efficiently and	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?  A Okay.  Q So the farmer that owns that field is having to put on commercial nitrogen if he wants the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on 09:57AM his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that — on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for that forage.  Q So the status quo would remain; he would still be using it where it was being produced even though there's a need for it most efficiently and effectively somewhere else? 09:58AM	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?  A Okay.  Q So the farmer that owns that field is having to put on commercial nitrogen if he wants the growth? 10:15AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on 09:57AM his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that — on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for that forage.  Q So the status quo would remain; he would still be using it where it was being produced even though there's a need for it most efficiently and effectively somewhere else?  O9:58AM  The reason I offered that scenario was the	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?  A Okay.  Q So the farmer that owns that field is having to put on commercial nitrogen if he wants the growth? 10:15AM  A Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on 09:57AM his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for that forage.  Q So the status quo would remain; he would still be using it where it was being produced even though there's a need for it most efficiently and effectively somewhere else? 09:58AM  A The reason I offered that scenario was the farmer will still need nitrogen input for his	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?  A Okay.  Q So the farmer that owns that field is having to put on commercial nitrogen if he wants the growth?  A Correct.  Q And he's having to put on commercial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on 09:57AM his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can 09:57AM demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for 09:58AM that forage.  Q So the status quo would remain; he would still be using it where it was being produced even though there's a need for it most efficiently and effectively somewhere else? 09:58AM  A The reason I offered that scenario was the farmer will still need nitrogen input for his pasture grasses; therefore, he would if he didn't	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?  A Okay.  Q So the farmer that owns that field is having to put on commercial nitrogen if he wants the growth? 10:15AM  A Correct.  Q And he's having to put on commercial phosphorus; right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on 09:57AM his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for that forage.  Q So the status quo would remain; he would still be using it where it was being produced even though there's a need for it most efficiently and effectively somewhere else? 09:58AM  A The reason I offered that scenario was the farmer will still need nitrogen input for his pasture grasses; therefore, he would if he didn't use the litter there, he would be in a situation of	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?  A Okay.  Q So the farmer that owns that field is having to put on commercial nitrogen if he wants the growth? 10:15AM  A Correct.  Q And he's having to put on commercial phosphorus; right?  A That would be the recommendation, yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Is it environmentally better to move it to the field that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Well, the farmer is growing pasture grasses on 09:57AM his farm. Where the litter originates still is going to need nitrogen to supply nitrogen to his pasture crop. So he has a need for nitrogen, and if he can use that litter on that on those fields and supply the nitrogen he needs to the crop and can 09:57AM demonstrate that using a site phosphorus index assessment tool or something can demonstrate that there's negligible risk of phosphorus being lost to the environment, then he would be well served to use it on his property to supply the nitrogen needed for 09:58AM that forage.  Q So the status quo would remain; he would still be using it where it was being produced even though there's a need for it most efficiently and effectively somewhere else? 09:58AM  A The reason I offered that scenario was the farmer will still need nitrogen input for his pasture grasses; therefore, he would if he didn't	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:16 a.m.  Q Dr. Coale, before we broke to change the tape, you were telling me that the producer who got the litter from his house or whatever would have to replace the nitrogen he needed with commercial nitrogen if the litter went somewhere else; do you remember that?  A Yes, I do. 10:15AM  Q Okay. Let's think about that a little further. Our out-of-watershed field that's the potential destination in our thought experiment here needs nitrogen and phosphorus; right?  A That's the assumption, it needs both. 10:15AM  Q That's the way I set it up; right?  A Okay.  Q So the farmer that owns that field is having to put on commercial nitrogen if he wants the growth? 10:15AM  A Correct.  Q And he's having to put on commercial phosphorus; right?

1	producer in the high phosphorus location to the	communicated with other designated experts in this
2	field in the low phosphorus location	case, that's fine. I don't have any problem with
3	A Uh-huh.	him answering that.
4	Q somebody would only have to buy nitrogen;	MR. NANCE: Well, I'm asking about any
5	right? 10:16AM	expert who might testify. 10:18AM
6	A In that scenario, yes. The producing farm	MR. McDANIEL: Well, I object.
7	would only have to buy nitrogen.	A I just don't know who is going to testify and
8	Q Okay. Instead of the receiving farm having to	who's not.
9	buy both nitrogen and phosphorus?	Q What PhD level scholars, whether they are
10	A Yes. 10:16AM	expert witness or not, have you talked about have 10:19AM
11	Q Which situation is environmentally better?	you talked with about this watershed?
12	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	A I've had telephone conversations with Billy
13	A Again, and this is the recommendation we used	Clay. I've had telephone conversations with Dr.
14	in situations I've been involved in where we have	Dicks. I can't remember his first name.
15	manure being transported from a producing to a 10:16AM	Q D-I-C-K-S? 10:19AM
16	receiving farm. Both farms at both ends, both the	A I believe that's how it's spelled, yes. Those
17	receiving farm and producing farm have to be under a	are the only ones that I my recollection is that
18	nutrient management plan, where the receiving farm	may have local knowledge.
19	has to document that there is not going to be in	Q Have you talked with Dr. Sharpley?
20	most cases they used the phosphorus index to show 10:17AM	A Yes. 10:20AM
21	that they're not going to be causing an	Q He's now at the University of Arkansas?
22	environmental concern by putting the litter on the	A Correct.
23	receiving farm. So, again, it depends on who is	Q Have you talked with him about the watershed?
24	receiving it and what that landscape site and what	A Yes.
25	those fields are like. 10:17AM	Q What have you and Dr. Sharpley talked about 10:20AM
	46	48
1	O Even though the receiving farm is putting on	about the watershed?
1	Q Even though the receiving farm is putting on both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?	about the watershed?  A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not
1 2 3	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not
2	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked
<u>2</u> 3	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not
2 3 4	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and
2 3 4 5	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things.
2 3 4 5 6	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might
2 3 4 5 6 7	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the I0:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River watershed? 10:18AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe they will.	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common practice in the IRW and what farming operations are 10:21AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River watershed? 10:18AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe they will.  Q Who would that be?	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common practice in the IRW and what farming operations are typically like across the watershed and practical assessment.  Q And what about Dr. Dicks?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River watershed? 10:18AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe they will.  Q Who would that be?  A I don't know who is scheduled to testify.	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common practice in the IRW and what farming operations are typically like across the watershed and practical assessment.  Q And what about Dr. Dicks?  A Dr. Dicks, our conversations were basically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River watershed? 10:18AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe they will.  Q Who would that be?  A I don't know who is scheduled to testify.  Q Have you talked to any expert like that? 10:18AM	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common practice in the IRW and what farming operations are typically like across the watershed and practical assessment.  Q And what about Dr. Dicks?  A Dr. Dicks, our conversations were basically based on his conducting a statistical analysis and 10:21AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River watershed? 10:18AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe they will.  Q Who would that be?  A I don't know who is scheduled to testify.  Q Have you talked to any expert like that? 10:18AM  A Who is going to testify?	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common practice in the IRW and what farming operations are typically like across the watershed and practical assessment.  Q And what about Dr. Dicks?  A Dr. Dicks, our conversations were basically based on his conducting a statistical analysis and asking, from my perspective, as a soil scientist
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River watershed? 10:18AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe they will.  Q Who would that be?  A I don't know who is scheduled to testify.  Q Have you talked to any expert like that? 10:18AM  A Who is going to testify?  Q Who even might testify.	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common practice in the IRW and what farming operations are typically like across the watershed and practical assessment.  Q And what about Dr. Dicks?  A Dr. Dicks, our conversations were basically based on his conducting a statistical analysis and asking, from my perspective, as a soil scientist whether I thought what he was doing made sense, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River watershed? 10:18AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe they will.  Q Who would that be?  A I don't know who is scheduled to testify.  Q Have you talked to any expert like that? 10:18AM  A Who is going to testify?  Q Who even might testify.  MR. McDANIEL: Well, he doesn't have to	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common practice in the IRW and what farming operations are typically like across the watershed and practical assessment.  Q And what about Dr. Dicks?  A Dr. Dicks, our conversations were basically based on his conducting a statistical analysis and asking, from my perspective, as a soil scientist whether I thought what he was doing made sense, and that's basically what our conversation involved.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River watershed? 10:18AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe they will.  Q Who would that be?  A I don't know who is scheduled to testify.  Q Have you talked to any expert like that? 10:18AM  A Who is going to testify?  Q Who even might testify.  MR. McDANIEL: Well, he doesn't have to discuss talking to somebody who might testify. If	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common practice in the IRW and what farming operations are typically like across the watershed and practical assessment.  Q And what about Dr. Dicks?  A Dr. Dicks, our conversations were basically based on his conducting a statistical analysis and asking, from my perspective, as a soil scientist whether I thought what he was doing made sense, and that's basically what our conversation involved.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, do you talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	both nitrogen and phosphorus anyway?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.  A The receiving farm should be managed within a nutrient management plan, yes. 10:17AM  Q In Oklahoma and Arkansas do you need a nutrient management plan if you're not using litter?  A I don't know what the regulations or rules are regarding that, but it's a good management practice.  Q To what extent have you personally been in the 10:17AM Illinois River watershed and looked it over?  A I don't know that I've ever been there.  Q To your knowledge, will the defendants have an expert testify who has been to the Illinois River watershed? 10:18AM  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I believe they will.  Q Who would that be?  A I don't know who is scheduled to testify.  Q Have you talked to any expert like that? 10:18AM  A Who is going to testify?  Q Who even might testify.  MR. McDANIEL: Well, he doesn't have to	A Let me take that back. I misspoke. Not specifically about the IRW. We've talked professionally about the phosphorus indices and those kind of things. 10:20AM  Q Did Dr. Sharpley indicate to you that he might testify?  A No. As a matter of fact, he laughed when he learned that I was. He said good luck.  Q What have you talked to Dr. Clay about? 10:20AM  A He's been involved in a couple of conference calls where multiple individuals were involved, and my what I gleaned from those conversations from his input was getting a feel for what's common practice in the IRW and what farming operations are typically like across the watershed and practical assessment.  Q And what about Dr. Dicks?  A Dr. Dicks, our conversations were basically based on his conducting a statistical analysis and asking, from my perspective, as a soil scientist whether I thought what he was doing made sense, and that's basically what our conversation involved.

1	poultry integrators be responsible for moving litter	where's the most effective and efficient use, what
2	to efficient and effective locations?	is the most efficient use of poultry litter in
3	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls	different situations, and if there is suggested by
4	for a legal conclusion.	the profession generally to suggest that the litter
5	A No. Basically if the scenario arises where 10:22AM	needs to be moved from Point A to Point B, then I 10:25AM
6	professionally it's suggested that litter be moved	have never been involved in deciding who should pay
7	from one location to another, from my personal	for that.
8	experience, that may be involved at a state	Q Has anyone in your profession that you know of
9	regulatory level, and my again my personal	recommended that the integrators be responsible for
10	experience in Maryland, I believe the poultry 10:23AM	moving it? 10:25AM
11	companies have been involved in helping to fund that	A Not that I recall.
12	operation but not totally.	Q Why is that?
13	Q What have the poultry companies done in	A I just don't remember that conversation
14	Maryland to help fund moving litter?	that's something we really don't professionally
15	A I'm not real clear on all the details of the 10:23AM	don't haven't dealt with. 10:26AM
16	program, the manure transport program. It's run	Q Why haven't you dealt with it?
17	through the Maryland Department of Agriculture. The	A Well, I haven't been in a situation where I
18	Maryland Department of Agriculture subsidizes the	needed to. We basically if there's a situation
19	transport costs, and my understanding is that the	where again, my experience goes back to the state
20	poultry companies bear a part of that cost. Whether 10:23AM	of Maryland where my firsthand experience is. In 10:26AM
21	it's a percentage or absolute number, I don't know.	that case, the State Department of Agriculture
22	Q So am I hearing correctly that in Maryland the	decided that if we're going to encourage transport
23	taxpayers fund moving some litter?	of litter from one farm to another farm, that the
24	A That's correct.	best way to do that would be to offer a subsidy to
25	Q And the integrators fund moving some litter? 10:23AM	subsidize the cost of that, and my understanding is 10:26AM
	50	52
1	A Well, I think it's both sources of funds	that state agency negotiated with the poultry
2	subsidize moving the litter. I don't think one load	companies to say, hey, listen, will you help us pay
3	is paid by one party and another load paid by	for this, and the answer was yes. It didn't involve
4	another party.	the scientists and didn't involve the researchers.
5		
-	I O - DUL THE TOTAL DROSTAIN IS TUNGED IN DATE DV - 10:24AJVI	It was basically a policy decision at state 10:27AM
6	r and	3 . 1
6 7	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?	management level.
	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.	3 . 1
7	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider
7 8	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?
7 8 9	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.
7 8 9 10	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the 10:27AM
7 8 9 10 11	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?
7 8 9 10 11 12	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient
7 8 9 10 11 12	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion. 10:24AM	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there are agricultural economists who worry about 10:27AM
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion. 10:24AM  Q You can answer.	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there are agricultural economists who worry about 10:27AM industry-wide ramifications and financial
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion. 10:24AM  Q You can answer.  A No, it does not preclude that.	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there are agricultural economists who worry about industry-wide ramifications and financial ramifications. It's just something I haven't dealt
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion. 10:24AM  Q You can answer.  A No, it does not preclude that.  Q So what have you done to consider the	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there are agricultural economists who worry about industry-wide ramifications and financial ramifications. It's just something I haven't dealt with.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion. 10:24AM  Q You can answer.  A No, it does not preclude that.  Q So what have you done to consider the advisability of the integrators moving the litter?	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there are agricultural economists who worry about industry-wide ramifications and financial ramifications. It's just something I haven't dealt with.  Q Aren't there soil scientists that think about
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion. 10:24AM  Q You can answer.  A No, it does not preclude that.  Q So what have you done to consider the advisability of the integrators moving the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls 10:24AM for a legal conclusion.  A I've done nothing in that area.	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there are agricultural economists who worry about 10:27AM industry-wide ramifications and financial ramifications. It's just something I haven't dealt with.  Q Aren't there soil scientists that think about things like that, too? 10:28AM
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion. 10:24AM  Q You can answer.  A No, it does not preclude that.  Q So what have you done to consider the advisability of the integrators moving the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls 10:24AM for a legal conclusion.  A I've done nothing in that area.  Q What about your profession generally?	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there are agricultural economists who worry about 10:27AM industry-wide ramifications and financial ramifications. It's just something I haven't dealt with.  Q Aren't there soil scientists that think about things like that, too? 10:28AM  A I'm sure there are.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion. 10:24AM  Q You can answer.  A No, it does not preclude that.  Q So what have you done to consider the advisability of the integrators moving the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls 10:24AM for a legal conclusion.  A I've done nothing in that area.  Q What about your profession generally?  MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there are agricultural economists who worry about industry-wide ramifications and financial ramifications. It's just something I haven't dealt with.  Q Aren't there soil scientists that think about things like that, too? 10:28AM  A I'm sure there are.  Q What do they think about it?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I don't know.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	taxpayers and in part by the integrators?  A As I understand it, yes.  Q Okay. In your profession, Dr. Coale, does your focus on farm management decisions A Uh-huh. 10:24AM  Q keep you from thinking about the advisability of having integrators take responsibility for the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls for a legal conclusion. 10:24AM  Q You can answer.  A No, it does not preclude that.  Q So what have you done to consider the advisability of the integrators moving the litter?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls 10:24AM for a legal conclusion.  A I've done nothing in that area.  Q What about your profession generally?	management level.  Q In your profession, Dr. Coale, you do consider the economics of the farm?  A Yes.  Q Why don't you consider the economics of the integrators?  A In my profession as a soil scientist, nutrient management specialist, I'm looking at my primary role, vision is at the farm level. I'm sure there are agricultural economists who worry about industry-wide ramifications and financial ramifications. It's just something I haven't dealt with.  Q Aren't there soil scientists that think about things like that, too? 10:28AM  A I'm sure there are.  Q What do they think about it?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.

1	phosphorus index	Q Okay. You don't know anything at all about
2	A Uh-huh.	litter hauling out of the watershed?
3	Q you don't even consider the appropriateness	A I don't know what is being proposed or what's
4	of having the integrators take responsibility for	being done.
5	the waste and move it where it might be the most 10:28AM	Q Okay. So it would be fair to say you won't 10:31AM
6	efficient and effective use?	offer any opinion on that at trial?
7	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's	A No, I don't expect to.
8	asking the witness to render an opinion that's	Q Okay. Turning the page to Page 5 at
9	something for the court to decide.	Subparagraph J, Dr. Coale, why did you tell us that
10	A That wasn't part of my thoughts. 10:28AM	elemental phosphorus does not exist as an isolated 10:32AM
11	Q And that's not part of your profession's	element in nature?
12	thoughts in using the phosphorus index?	A Basically because some folks get confused with
13	MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.	what phosphorus forms exist in nature, and that's
14	A Speaking broadly about my profession, that	just to clarify that elemental P doesn't.
15	profession of soil scientists, nutrient management 10:29AM	Q Who is confused about that? 10:52AM
16	specialists, generally, broadly, no.	A Over my years with talking to various
17	Q I think we kind of touched on this, Dr. Coale,	individuals, some people from farmers to policy
18	but on Page 4, Subparagraph I, you tell us that the	makers to advisors.
19	primary reason farmers apply poultry litter to	Q Okay, and you agree with what Dr. Johnson says
20	pastures is as source of plant-available nitrogen; 10:29AM	about that in 3F, his report as indicated here? 10:52AM
21	is that right?	A Right. I said that I agreed with that
22	A That's correct.	statement.
23	Q I think we pretty much agreed to that. And	Q All right. What's phosphoric acid?
24	that nitrogen is the macronutrient that is required	A It's an acid that contains phosphorus.
25	in relatively large quantities by grass forage 10:29AM	Q Okay, and why are you mentioning it here? 10:52AM
	54	56
1	plants; is that correct?	A You are talking Subparagraph K?
2	A Correct.	Q Yes, sir. I'm sorry.
3	Q Okay. Then you say, for some farmers poultry	A Again, because over the years people talk
4	litter is a readily available and cost effective	about phosphoric acid and phosphorus interchangeably
5	course of nitrogen fertilizer that enhances forage 10:29AM	with other forms of phosphorus, and it's just to 10:52AM
6	grass production and permits increased capacity to	help clarify what exists and what doesn't.
7	feed and grow pasture-grazed beef cattle; right?	Q Okay. What's the significance in Paragraph L
8	A Correct.	there of saying that that list of substances are not
9	Q For what farmers is it a cost effective source	typically contained in commercial poultry litter?
10	of nitrogen? 10:30AM	A I was asked to review the list that Roger 10:52AM
11	A For the farmer where the cost of spreading the	Olsen presented in his materials that I've
12	litter that he has on his property is less than the	referenced here, and looking at that list that he
13	cost of purchasing commercial fertilizer at that	presented, based on my experience and recollection
14	same nitrogen-supplying rate.	of literature, et cetera, those items I listed below
15	Q Are there other farmers for which it's not a 10:30AM	there were entries that I had not counted being part 10:52AM
16	cost effective source of nitrogen?	of normal poultry litter samples.
17	A If the farmer doesn't have litter on the	Q And so you are just taking issue with what Dr.
18	property or very close by and would be would have	Olsen said about that?
19	to bear the cost of shipping it in from somewhere	A Right.
20	else to utilize, it may be cheaper for him to 10:30AM	Q Okay. Let me show you what has I've just 10:52AM
21	utilize urea or other purchased fertilizer.	marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2.
22	Q Okay. What do you know about efforts to	MR. NANCE: And since this has a Bates
23	transport litter out of the Illinois River	number on it, Scott, I'm not going to bother to
24	watershed?	write that.
25	A I haven't looked into that. 10:31AM	Q This is something that was in your considered 10:52AM
	55	57

1	materials, was it not?	Q Dr. Coale, we have talked about producers of
2	A I believe it was.	litter in the Illinois River watershed.
3	Q How did you come to have this was	A Uh-huh.
4	originally a PowerPoint, wasn't it?	Q Do you know what percentages of the producers
5	A I believe it was. 10:52AM	of litter, I mean people who own the houses, in the 10:52AM
6	Q And I've printed it off here so we can look at	Illinois River watershed apply litter on their own
7	it today. How did you come to have this PowerPoint?	land?
8	A I can't honestly say I can remember. It was	A I don't know that.
9	part of a large package of materials that were	Q Okay. Do you know if anyone on behalf of the
10	reported to me when I first was trying to get up to 10:52AM	defendants knows that? 10:52AM
11	speed before the PI hearing.	A I'm not aware.
12	Q And what was in that package of materials	Q Okay. Have you determined, Dr. Coale, how
13	besides this PowerPoint?	much land in the Illinois River watershed what's
14	A I don't recall. Materials came in in several	our magic word could receive litter without any
15	batches, and I don't recall what else was in there, 10:52AM	other restrictions applying, pastureland? 10:52AM
16	what came when.	A No, I have not.
17		Q Do you know if anyone has determined that on
18	, ,	behalf of the defendants?
19	has not been provided us as part of your considered	
	materials?	A I know that Dr. Dicks did an estimation, and I reviewed that estimation, and all I could conclude 10:52AM
20	A Not that I'm aware of. 10:52AM	
21	Q Do you know Dr. Joern and Dr. Moore?	was that the methodology and logic he used in
22	A Yes, I do.	producing in his estimation, I found to be sound.
23	Q Who is Dr. Joern, J-O-E-R-N?	Q We can get to that later. Are you in a
24	A Dr. Joern, that's pronounced correctly. He's	position to say his estimation is true and correct?
25	a professor at Purdue University. 10:52AM	A Numerically, no. 10:52AM
	58	60
1	Q And how well do you know him; how did you come	Q Dr. Coale, have you determined how much land
2	to know him?	there is in the Illinois River watershed,
3	A Professionally we were working in a lot of the	pastureland, which has no other restrictions that
4	same areas, and I've known him for probably fifteen	would apply, for which the owners of that land want
5	years. 10:52AM	litter but can't get it? 10:52AM
6	Q What about Dr. Moore?	A No. I've not been involved in that.
7	A Same answer.	Q Okay. I'm kind of asking about an unmet
8	Q Is he also at Purdue?	demand for litter.
9	A No. He's with the USDA.	A Right.
10	Q And where does he work? 10:52AM	
11		Q Do you know if anyone on behalf of the 10:52AM defendants has determined that or is trying to
12	A At University of Arkansas.  Q What significance did this PowerPoint have in	determine that?
13	your preparation to testify?	A Not that I know of.
14		
15	A Honestly, not much. I think this is something I probably looked through and then put it away. 10:52AM	Q Okay. Have you determined, Dr. Coale, the amount of land in the Illinois River watershed for 10:52AM
16		
19 17		which other restrictions don't apply where there is
	on any question about phosphorus being a hazardous	an unmet demand for litter but which has an STP
18	waste or not being a hazardous waste?	below 65?
19	A No, sir.	A No.
20		Q And if I give you any other STP I want, would 10:52AM
20	Q Do you know who will offer any such testimony 10:52AM	
21	on behalf of the defense?	the answer be the same?
21 22	on behalf of the defense?  A No, I'm not aware of who would, if anyone	the answer be the same?  A It would be the same.
21 22 23	on behalf of the defense?  A No, I'm not aware of who would, if anyone would.	the answer be the same?  A It would be the same.  Q So if I ask you about 100 STP, it would be the
21 22 23 24	on behalf of the defense?  A No, I'm not aware of who would, if anyone would.  Q Do you know who might offer such testimony?	the answer be the same?  A It would be the same.  Q So if I ask you about 100 STP, it would be the same answer?
21 22 23	on behalf of the defense?  A No, I'm not aware of who would, if anyone would.	the answer be the same?  A It would be the same.  Q So if I ask you about 100 STP, it would be the

1	those kind of scenarios.	a reduced rate, may not contain enough
2	Q Has anyone from the defense determined such an	plant-available nitrogen to give the forage crop all
3	estimate?	the nitrogen it needs to reach maximum productivity.
4	A Not that I know of.	So if you want to reach maximum productivity, you'd
5	Q Okay. For 65 or 100 or any other STP? 10:52AM	have to supplement with another source of nitrogen, 10:52AM
6	A Not that I'm aware.	probably a purchased fertilizer nitrogen.
7	Q Okay.	Q Why have these recently enacted regulations
8	MR. ELROD: Can we do a timeout?	done that to farmers?
9	MR. NANCE: Yes.	A Speaking generally?
10	(Whereupon, a discussion was held off 10:52AM	Q Generally. 10:52AM
11	the Record.)	A Most the regulations that I'm aware of
12	Q Nitrogen is typically the largest input	across the country typically fall into the
13	nutrient required for management of pasture grasses;	guidance that comes out of the recommendations
14	is that correct?	typically falls into three different categories.
15	A Typically, yes. 10:52AM	One is you apply the manure at the, quote, normal or 10:52AM
16	Q Particularly in pasture-grazed beef	historic rate, which would be the nitrogen-based
17	production?	rate, and there's a middle category that says apply
18	A Typically, yes.	it at a phosphorus-based rate, which meets the
19	Q What's the ratio typically in this watershed	phosphorus needs of the situation, and a third
20	between the need for nitrogen and the need for 10:52AM	category, which would be don't apply any manure at 10:52AM
21	phosphorus in those pasture grasses?	all.
22	A Well, speaking generally in pasture grasses in	So before those guidances were enacted
23		
24	general, it's somewhere between six to eight times	well, after they had been enacted, then the that
25	more nitrogen than phosphorus.	P-based rate, that middle scenario, would be this scenario where you may be able to apply a reduced 10:52AM
49	Q Okay. Now, you say in 4B at the bottom of 10:52AM	scenario where you may be able to apply a reduced 10:52AM 64
	02	01
1	Page 5, you say historically litter applications to	rate of litter but not but that reduced rate
2	grass pastures usually have been based on N	wouldn't be supplying all the nitrogen that the crop
3	fertilization rates. We talked about that a minute	needs.
4	ago; do you remember that?	Q And isn't the reason for the reduced rate an
5	A Correct. 10:52AM	environmental concern? 10:52AM
6	Q So that's correct?	A Yes.
7	A Yes.	Q Okay. In 4C there on Page 6, Dr. Coale, the
8	Q Then you say, even if soil test P levels are	second sentence says, root systems of forage grasses
9	adequate, N must be applied to maintain pasture	accumulate inorganic soluble P from deep below the
10	productivity; right? 10:52AM	soil surface and convert it to organic P in the 10:52AM
11	A Yes.	aboveground tissues of the forage grass. How deeply
12	Q At the top of Page 6 in that same subparagraph	do the root systems draw that organic P inorganic
13	you say, recently enacted regulations this is the	P? Excuse me.
14	third line down that limit poultry litter	A Well, that's a very general statement. It
15	applications to P-based rates can create scenarios 10:52AM	really depends on the crop that's being grown, what 10:52AM
16	in which farmers and ranchers may no longer be able	the crop species is and the soil it's being grown
17	to meet the total N needs for the forage crop from	on.
18	poultry litter applications. Do you see that?	Q Let's talk about forage grasses.
19	A Uh-huh.	A Forage grasses.
20	Q What do you mean by that, sir? 10:52AM	Q Particularly in the IRW, if you know 10:52AM
21	A If the litter application rate is limited	specifically.
22	based on the maximum litter that can be applied	A Well, forage grasses in general, there would
23	under what is known as a P-based rate, a	be rooting depths down to maybe 24 inches maximum,
24	phosphorus-based rate, then that amount of litter	something like that.
25	may be applied, but that amount of litter, which is 10:52AM	Q From how far down do they draw phosphorus? 10:52AM
	63	65

1	A Phosphorus is usually taken up at the root	has to become part of the soil before it can take it
2	tips, so it would be all the way down to the depth.	up.
3	Q So if that's the case, why do we put	Q And the simple answer may be too simple in
4	phosphorus on the surface?	this case; right?
5	A Because there are a lot of roots near the 10:52AM	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 10:52AM
6	surface, especially of a grass plant. They can root	Q We know that when we put down litter, we know
7	deeply, but they also root laterally very profusely.	we're putting phosphorus onto the soil; correct?
8	So if phosphorus is put on the soil surface and as	A Correct.
9		
	it works its way into the soil, the roots have access to it, even at the shallow depth. 10:52AM	Q And we're doing that in order for the phosphorus if we care about phosphorus so the 10:52AM
10	1	1 1
11	Q Do forage grasses get most of their phosphorus	phosphorus can be available to the plants; right?
12	from shallow depths or from two feet down?	A Correct.
13	A I don't know if I can answer that answer. I	Q I guess if we don't care about the phosphorus,
14	don't know.	we don't it doesn't matter, does it; if we're
15	Q Okay. Do they get most of their nitrogen at a 10:52AM	just using nitrogen and there's already enough 10:52AM
16	shallow depth or from two feet down?	phosphorus in the soil, we don't care where it comes
17	A Probably the same. I don't know what depth	from?
18	they would get most of it from.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
19	Q Where does the phosphorus that's two feet down	A It's going to come with the litter
20	come from, particularly where litter is applied? 10:52AM	application, but if your original question was what 10:52AM
21	A Well, some of it could be native to the soil.	percentage of the phosphorus taken up by a forage
22	There are some soils which have substantial	grass plant comes from native phosphorus of a soil
23	phosphorus with depth, especially if the rock	origin and what phosphorus would come from past
24	material it developed from has phosphorus materials	litter applications, I can't answer that question.
25	in it. Phosphorus can move slowly down through the 10:52AM	Q You say at the bottom of Subparagraph C, 10:52AM
	66	68
1	soil and that note of marrowent decomposed is regired	
1	soil, and that rate of movement downward is varied	manure phosphorus that is deposited onto the soil
2	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of
2	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including
2 3 4	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please.
2 3 4 5	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of  fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please.  Subparagraph C? 10:52AM
2 3 4 5 6	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed?  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.
2 3 4 5 6 7	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are? MS. HILL: 4C.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are? MS. HILL: 4C. Q 4C at the top of the page.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the 10:52AM	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are? MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page. A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are? MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page. A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are? MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page. A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence. Q Do you see where we are? MS. HILL: 4C. Q 4C at the top of the page. A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now. Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence. Q Do you see where we are? MS. HILL: 4C. Q 4C at the top of the page. A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now. Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please.  Subparagraph C? 10:52AM  MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?  MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page.  A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it. Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has. Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please.  Subparagraph C? 10:52AM  MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?  MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page.  A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it. Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has. Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?  MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break.	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please.  Subparagraph C? 10:52AM  MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?  MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page.  A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the phosphorus, do I have it correctly, that is in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?  MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break. COURT REPORTER: I just need to plug in.	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please.  Subparagraph C? 10:52AM  MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?  MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page.  A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the phosphorus, do I have it correctly, that is in cattle manure returns and is recycled into more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?  MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break. COURT REPORTER: I just need to plug in.  A Could you repeat the question, please?	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM  MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?  MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page.  A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the phosphorus, do I have it correctly, that is in cattle manure returns and is recycled into more grass; right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?  MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break. COURT REPORTER: I just need to plug in.  A Could you repeat the question, please? (Whereupon, the court reporter read 10:52AM	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM  MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?  MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page.  A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the phosphorus, do I have it correctly, that is in cattle manure returns and is recycled into more grass; right?  A Correct. 10:53AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?  MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break. COURT REPORTER: I just need to plug in.  A Could you repeat the question, please? (Whereupon, the court reporter read 10:52AM back the previous question.)	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM  MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?  MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page.  A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the phosphorus, do I have it correctly, that is in cattle manure returns and is recycled into more grass; right?  A Correct. 10:53AM  Q And the same thing with poultry litter that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it. Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of? A I haven't talked to anyone who has. Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?  MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break.  COURT REPORTER: I just need to plug in.  A Could you repeat the question, please?  (Whereupon, the court reporter read 10:52AM back the previous question.)  A Well, the simple answer is that all of it	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM  MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?  MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page.  A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the phosphorus, do I have it correctly, that is in cattle manure returns and is recycled into more grass; right?  A Correct. 10:53AM  Q And the same thing with poultry litter that's applied on the same field?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?  MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break. COURT REPORTER: I just need to plug in.  A Could you repeat the question, please? (Whereupon, the court reporter read 10:52AM back the previous question.)  A Well, the simple answer is that all of it comes from the soil, but I don't know where the	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are? MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page. A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the phosphorus, do I have it correctly, that is in cattle manure returns and is recycled into more grass; right?  A Correct. 10:53AM  Q And the same thing with poultry litter that's applied on the same field?  A Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?  MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break.  COURT REPORTER: I just need to plug in.  A Could you repeat the question, please?  (Whereupon, the court reporter read 10:52AM back the previous question.)  A Well, the simple answer is that all of it comes from the soil, but I don't know where the original source of the phosphorus was. A plant	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM  MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are?  MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page.  A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the phosphorus, do I have it correctly, that is in cattle manure returns and is recycled into more grass; right?  A Correct. 10:53AM  Q And the same thing with poultry litter that's applied on the same field?  A Correct.  Q Okay. Some of the phosphorus that is applied
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	depending on the chemistry and the type of soil that we're talking about at that location.  Q What can you tell me about the chemistry in the soil in the Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM  A Specifically, I haven't studied it.  Q Has anybody studied it for the defendants that you know of?  A I haven't talked to anyone who has.  Q How much of the phosphorus that is in the forage grasses in the Illinois River watershed where litter is applied comes from the litter versus comes from the native soil?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. MR. ELROD: Do we need to stop for a second?  MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break. COURT REPORTER: I just need to plug in.  A Could you repeat the question, please? (Whereupon, the court reporter read 10:52AM back the previous question.)  A Well, the simple answer is that all of it comes from the soil, but I don't know where the	surface by grazing cattle is subject to a variety of fates including  A Let me catch up with you, please. Subparagraph C? 10:52AM MR. McDANIEL: Yeah, last sentence.  Q Do you see where we are? MS. HILL: 4C.  Q 4C at the top of the page. A I'm not on the C. Yes, I see it now.  Q Manure phosphorus is subject to a variety of fates, including recycled uptake by pasture plants and transportation with surface runoff and leaching waters; do you see that?  A Yes. 10:53AM  Q Let's talk about that a minute. Some of the phosphorus, do I have it correctly, that is in cattle manure returns and is recycled into more grass; right?  A Correct. 10:53AM  Q And the same thing with poultry litter that's applied on the same field?  A Correct.

1	A Potentially, yes.	of corn, for example, that are blended in now. Some	
2	Q As is phosphorus from poultry litter?	of them have a much higher available level of	
3	A Potentially, yes.	phosphorus than historically. So maybe it's less of	
4	Q Okay, and some of it is subject to leaching	a practice now, but I don't know if it's what	
5	into the ground, the cattle phosphorus as well as 10:54AM	percent decrease has been or anything.	10:57AM
6	the chicken phosphorus?	Q Do you know anything about the specific	
7	A Potentially, yes, that can happen.	enrichment of feed in the Illinois River watershed?	
8	Q All right. Dr. Coale, how much of the grain	A No, I don't.	
9	that goes into poultry feed in the Illinois River	Q Okay. Dr. Coale, stepping back for a minute,	
10	watershed is grown in the Illinois River watershed? 10:54AM	is it your testimony that none of the phosphorus	10:57AM
11	A I don't know.	that goes into poultry feed in the Illinois River	
12	Q Do you know if any is?	watershed and comes out in poultry waste ever gets	
13	A My understanding is a small amount.	to the water in the Illinois River watershed?	
14	Q Okay. Typically in these concentrated growing	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	
15	operations, the feed comes from somewhere else, 10:55AM	A I don't think you can ever say absolutely	10:58AM
16	doesn't it?	none.	
17	A Typically, yes, my understanding it does.	Q So would you be scientifically comfortable	
18	Q Okay. Do you know in absolute terms how much	with the proposition that some of that phosphorus	
19	is imported into the watershed, feed, grain?	that is in the feed and then goes into the waste	
20	A No, I don't. 10:55AM	gets into the water in the Illinois River watershed?	10:58AM
21	Q Do you know in relative terms how much feed,	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	
22	grain is imported into the watershed?	A I'd say potentially that's possible.	
23	A No, I don't.	Q Well, a lot of things are potentially	
24	Q Do you know if the defendants blend the feed	possible. Are as a scientist, are you prepared	
25	they use in the watershed in or about the watershed; 10:55AM	to say that some of it does get in the water in the	10:58AM
	70	72	
1	do you know where it's blended and distributed from?	Illinois River watershed?	
2	A I have no knowledge of that.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, asked	
3	Q Is the grain that's used in poultry litter	and answered.	
4 5	typically enriched with more phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: You say grain used in 10:56AM	A No. I can't I have no knowledge of	10:59AM
э 6	MR. McDANIEL: You say grain used in 10:56AM poultry litter?	phosphorus quantitatively moving anywhere within the Illinois River watershed.	10.39AW
7	MR. NANCE: Excuse me. Poultry feed,	Q You don't know anything about phosphorus	
8	you're right.	moving in the watershed?	
9	A I know, again, based on my knowledge of	A I said quantitatively.	
10	poultry production on the eastern shore, the 10:56AM	Q Okay. Tell me what you mean when you say	10:59AM
11	Delmarva and Maryland area, it used to be very	quantitatively.	
12	common practice, and now I believe it's less common.	A If you asked me can one pound move from a	
13	It probably is in some cases and is not in other	poultry farm into an adjacent body of water, can two	
14	cases. I don't know.	pounds, can three pounds move, I don't know. I can	
15	Q Why was it done? 10:56AM	talk about the how we understand that the	10:59AM
16	A Historically it was believed that there was	mechanisms work and how we understand how the	
17	not enough available phosphorus in the grains	nutrients move in the landscape, but I don't have	
18	available to the plant excuse me, available to	any information on quantitative pounds of delivery	
19	the bird to give the bird a healthy diet, so they	to the water.	
20	would add it. 10:56AM	Q Okay, and I'm not asking you to name a	10:59AM
21	Q Okay, and is that no longer the understanding?	specific quantity.	
22	A I think we're in a transition phase and,	A Okay.	
23	again, poultry nutrition is not my area of	Q But to a reasonable degree of scientific	
24	expertise, but my understanding is there are	certainty, you can say, can you not, that some of	
25	advances in diet formulations and the specific types 10:57AM	that phosphorus gets into the water in the Illinois	11:00AM
	71	73	

1	River watershed?	rains and there's runoff
2	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. Third	A Uh-huh.
3	time on that question.	Q there's also an increased concentration of
4 5	A The water that leaves any watershed water that starts from rainfall and moves through a soil, 11:00AM	soluble phosphorus because the STPs are elevated;
	<u> </u>	right? 11:02AM
6 7	over a soil, across the landscape and into a water	A Typically when you have elevated soil test
8	body is going to be carrying some phosphorus with it. So if it moves through one of these sites where	phosphorus levels, there's elevated soluble phosphorus levels, yes, in the soil.
9		
10	litter has been applied, that water when and if it reaches a water body will have some level large 11:00AM	
11	•	defendants' waste has elevated the STP, even though there's no litter on it right now, fresh litter
12	or small, I don't know some level of phosphorus in it.	
13		
14	Q Okay. So some of that phosphorus in the water originates with the defendants' waste, poultry	Q it's going to run off with some of the phosphorus that originated with the defendants'
15	waste? 11:00AM	waste; right? 11:03AM
16	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
17	A I don't know.	A If runoff is generated.
18	Q Some? You don't know?	Q Right.
19	A No, I don't.	A And that's the premise you've got to
20	Q Really? 11:01AM	understand, that if runoff is generated from a site 11:03AM
21	MR. McDANIEL: Move to strike.	and there is an elevated soil test level phosphorus
22		at that site, then that runoff will be carrying
23	Q Well, you know there's a lot of poultry waste land applied in the Illinois River watershed; right?	phosphorus with it.
24	A Correct.	Q Okay. Have you looked at the data that shows
25	Q And I'm not asking you to vouch for 200,000 11:01AM	that phosphorus transports spikes after a big rain? 11:03AM
29	74	76
1	tons or 300,000 tons or 400,000 tons, but there's a	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
2	lot?	Q In the Illinois River watershed?
3	A There's some applied, yes, sir.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
	** *	, ·
4	Q Okay, and when it goes on the ground, that	A No, sir.
4 5	Q Okay, and when it goes on the ground, that litter goes on the ground and it rains on that 11:01AM	A No, sir. Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I 11:03AM
5	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that 11:01AM	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I 11:03AM
5 6	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I 11:03AM represented to you that that happens?
5 6 7	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I 11:03AM represented to you that that happens?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're
5 6 7 8	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it? A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I 11:03AM represented to you that that happens?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data.
5 6 7 8 9	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it? A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I 11:03AM represented to you that that happens?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data.  A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the
5 6 7 8 9	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it? A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff. Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or 11:01AM	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I 11:03AM represented to you that that happens?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data.  A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that 11:04AM
5 6 7 8 9 10	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it? A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff. Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I 11:03AM represented to you that that happens?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data.  A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that 11:04AM happens or not.  Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it? A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff. Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site? A There could be, yes. Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that 11:04AM happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	litter; goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  11:01AM	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, 11:04AM
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  A Correct.	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  A Correct.  Q And you know that STPs in the Illinois River	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the soil, has more elevated phosphorus in runoff if
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  A Correct.  Q And you know that STPs in the Illinois River watershed are elevated because of that land	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the soil, has more elevated phosphorus in runoff if runoff is generated than subsequent rainfalls.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  A Correct.  Q And you know that STPs in the Illinois River watershed are elevated because of that land application of poultry litter; right?	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the soil, has more elevated phosphorus in runoff if runoff is generated than subsequent rainfalls. Q All right. What stops that elevated
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  A Correct.  Q And you know that STPs in the Illinois River watershed are elevated because of that land application of poultry litter; right?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  11:01AM  11:01AM  11:01AM  11:01AM	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the soil, has more elevated phosphorus in runoff if runoff is generated than subsequent rainfalls. Q All right. What stops that elevated phosphorus in the runoff from getting into the  11:04AM
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	litter; goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  A Correct.  Q And you know that STPs in the Illinois River watershed are elevated because of that land application of poultry litter; right?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A We talked about this earlier, that I believe	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the soil, has more elevated phosphorus in runoff if runoff is generated than subsequent rainfalls. Q All right. What stops that elevated phosphorus in the runoff from getting into the streams and creeks and river of the Illinois River
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  A Correct.  Q And you know that STPs in the Illinois River watershed are elevated because of that land application of poultry litter; right?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A We talked about this earlier, that I believe from the data I've seen and what I've learned, that	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the soil, has more elevated phosphorus in runoff if runoff is generated than subsequent rainfalls. Q All right. What stops that elevated phosphorus in the runoff from getting into the streams and creeks and river of the Illinois River watershed?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  A Correct.  Q And you know that STPs in the Illinois River watershed are elevated because of that land application of poultry litter; right?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A We talked about this earlier, that I believe from the data I've seen and what I've learned, that some sites are.	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the soil, has more elevated phosphorus in runoff if runoff is generated than subsequent rainfalls. Q All right. What stops that elevated phosphorus in the runoff from getting into the streams and creeks and river of the Illinois River watershed? A What stops it from getting there?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession? A Correct.  Q And you know that STPs in the Illinois River watershed are elevated because of that land application of poultry litter; right? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A We talked about this earlier, that I believe from the data I've seen and what I've learned, that some sites are.  Q Okay, and so in addition to the phosphorus	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the soil, has more elevated phosphorus in runoff if runoff is generated than subsequent rainfalls. Q All right. What stops that elevated phosphorus in the runoff from getting into the streams and creeks and river of the Illinois River watershed? A What stops it from getting there? Q Well, you say you don't know that any of it
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	litter goes on the ground and it rains on that litter, if there's runoff from that site, there will be soluble phosphorus in it?  A If runoff is generated, yes, there will be phosphorus in that runoff.  Q Okay, and there may also be erosion or particulate phosphorus runoff from that site?  A There could be, yes.  Q Okay. That's a common mechanism A Correct.  Q in the literature known to your profession?  A Correct.  Q And you know that STPs in the Illinois River watershed are elevated because of that land application of poultry litter; right?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A We talked about this earlier, that I believe from the data I've seen and what I've learned, that some sites are.	Q Okay. Would that surprise you if I represented to you that that happens? MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You're going to have to show him the data. A Okay. Following a rainfall event in the Illinois River watershed, I don't know if that happens or not. Q Do you know if it happens anywhere in the world that litter has been used that phosphorus runs off after a big rain? A Generally the first or second rainfall event, after a manure application to the surface of the soil, has more elevated phosphorus in runoff if runoff is generated than subsequent rainfalls. Q All right. What stops that elevated phosphorus in the runoff from getting into the streams and creeks and river of the Illinois River watershed? A What stops it from getting there?

1	A Well, you don't know if you're looking at a	O Does he have data that shows hundreds of sites
2	particular field and if there's runoff generated	with elevated STP in the watershed?
3	from that field, you don't I don't know from a	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
4	very without looking at a specific site whether	A I would not say hun there were several,
5	there's any kind of activity between that field and 11:05AM	
	•	1
6	the receiving water body. That runoff water that's	that I looked at that were elevated.
7	generated from that field and can be measured in	Q Would it be thousands?
8	that field and we can talk about that phosphorus	A I don't recall. I don't recall how many total
9	content in that runoff generated from that field, I	were, and I don't recall how many percent of that
10	don't have knowledge about where that runoff ends 11:05AM	were total elevated. 11:07AM
11	up. It may never make it to the water body or it	Q Where does the water in the Illinois River and
12	might. I don't know.	its tributaries come from?
13	Q What would it take for you to have knowledge?	A Rainfall.
14	A We would have to know what the conveyance and	Q And does the rainfall fall on the surface of
15	the conductivity from that application site where 11:05AM	the earth? 11:07AM
16	that runoff was generated to the receiving water	A Yes, it does.
17	body.	Q Have you ever seen it in the Illinois River
18	Q So you would have to go out there and look; is	watershed?
19	that what you're telling me?	A Have I ever my own eyes?
20	A There would have to be, yeah, physical 11:05AM	Q Yeah. 11:07AM
21	assessment made.	A I don't think I've ever been to the Illinois
22	Q I mean, by you?	River watershed.
23	A If I had the tools to assess it. It may not	Q So are you comfortable assuming that it rains
24	be something I can assess.	in the Illinois River watershed?
25	Q How many sites are there in the Illinois River 11:06AM	A I'm comfortable that it rains there, yes, sir. 11:07AM
23	78	80
	, 0	
1	watershed where the STP has been elevated by the	Q Okay, and are you comfortable that the water
1 2	-	Q Okay, and are you comfortable that the water in the watershed comes from rain?
	watershed where the STP has been elevated by the application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	· · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	in the watershed comes from rain? A Yes, sir.
2	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	in the watershed comes from rain? A Yes, sir.
2 3 4	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir. 11:08AM
2 3 4 5	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  11:06AM  A I don't know.	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir. 11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?
2 3 4 5 6 7	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  11:06AM  A I don't know.	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir. 11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir. 11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir. 11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir. 11:08AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of  phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of  phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number. 11:06AM	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of  phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've  seen it be transported, but are you telling me that  11:08AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number. 11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of  phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've  seen it be transported, but are you telling me that  as the expert, you don't know that some of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number. 11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised there?	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir. 11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir. 11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've seen it be transported, but are you telling me that as the expert, you don't know that some of the defendants' phosphorus makes it into the water in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number. 11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised there?  A I've read it but I don't it wasn't	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've seen it be transported, but are you telling me that as the expert, you don't know that some of the defendants' phosphorus makes it into the water in the Illinois River watershed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number. 11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised there?  A I've read it but I don't it wasn't important to what I was trying to learn.	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've seen it be transported, but are you telling me that as the expert, you don't know that some of the defendants' phosphorus makes it into the water in the Illinois River watershed?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, asked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed?  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number.  11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised there?  A I've read it but I don't it wasn't important to what I was trying to learn.  Q Did you look at the data that Gordon Johnson  11:06AM	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've seen it be transported, but are you telling me that as the expert, you don't know that some of the defendants' phosphorus makes it into the water in the Illinois River watershed?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, asked and answered.  11:08AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number. 11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised there?  A I've read it but I don't it wasn't important to what I was trying to learn.  Q Did you look at the data that Gordon Johnson looked at?	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've seen it be transported, but are you telling me that as the expert, you don't know that some of the defendants' phosphorus makes it into the water in the Illinois River watershed?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, asked and answered.  11:08AM  A I have no way of determining of the phosphorus
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed?  11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number.  11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised there?  A I've read it but I don't it wasn't important to what I was trying to learn.  Q Did you look at the data that Gordon Johnson 11:06AM looked at?  A I looked at some of the data he did, yes.	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've seen it be transported, but are you telling me that as the expert, you don't know that some of the defendants' phosphorus makes it into the water in the Illinois River watershed?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, asked and answered.  11:08AM  A I have no way of determining of the phosphorus that makes it to the water body, where that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number. 11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised there?  A I've read it but I don't it wasn't important to what I was trying to learn.  Q Did you look at the data that Gordon Johnson 11:06AM looked at?  A I looked at some of the data he did, yes.  Q Hundreds of sites with elevated STPs in the	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've seen it be transported, but are you telling me that as the expert, you don't know that some of the defendants' phosphorus makes it into the water in the Illinois River watershed?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, asked and answered.  11:08AM  A I have no way of determining of the phosphorus that makes it to the water body, where that phosphorus came from. That is beyond my area of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number. 11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised there?  A I've read it but I don't it wasn't important to what I was trying to learn.  Q Did you look at the data that Gordon Johnson 11:06AM looked at?  A I looked at some of the data he did, yes.  Q Hundreds of sites with elevated STPs in the watershed?	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've seen it be transported, but are you telling me that as the expert, you don't know that some of the defendants' phosphorus makes it into the water in the Illinois River watershed?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, asked and answered.  11:08AM  A I have no way of determining of the phosphorus that makes it to the water body, where that phosphorus came from. That is beyond my area of expertise, and I just don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	application of poultry waste?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A How many you say?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q A thousand?  A I don't know.  Q How many poultry farms are there in the  Illinois River watershed? 11:06AM  A I don't know.  Q You have no knowledge of that at all?  A I have paid no attention to the number of farms, the number in the watershed. I just don't know that number. 11:06AM  Q Do you know how many birds have been raised there?  A I've read it but I don't it wasn't important to what I was trying to learn.  Q Did you look at the data that Gordon Johnson 11:06AM looked at?  A I looked at some of the data he did, yes.  Q Hundreds of sites with elevated STPs in the	in the watershed comes from rain?  A Yes, sir.  Q And that rain falls down?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Are you comfortable that water flows downhill?  A Yes, sir.  Q Even though you haven't seen it in the  Illinois River watershed?  A Yes, sir.  11:08AM  Q Okay, and you know the mechanisms of phosphorus transport; right?  A I understand those, yes.  Q Okay. I'm not asking about whether you've seen it be transported, but are you telling me that as the expert, you don't know that some of the defendants' phosphorus makes it into the water in the Illinois River watershed?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, asked and answered.  11:08AM  A I have no way of determining of the phosphorus that makes it to the water body, where that phosphorus came from. That is beyond my area of

1	you?	of that phosphorus was by any tools that I'm aware
2	A Yes, sir.	of. Once it becomes part of that soil phosphorus
3	Q And you teach about phosphorus indices?	pool, I don't know of a mechanism or a procedure or
4	A Yes, sir.	process or technique to identify where that
5	Q And you know about the transport methods for 11:09AM	phosphorus originally originated from. That's why 11:12AM
6	phosphorus, don't you?	I'm saying I can't tell you whether one pound, ten
7	A Yes, sir.	pounds, zero pounds or whatever of litter-originated
8	Q So what about that is beyond your area of	phosphorus ended up in that runoff water.
9	expertise?	Q To what extent is it a scientifically
10	A There are multiple sources of phosphorus in 11:09AM	defensible conclusion, that given the history of 11:12AM
11	this watershed.	this watershed, none of the phosphorus that came
12	Q Well, I'm sorry. Answer my question and tell	through the defendants' chickens or turkeys has made
13	me what about that is beyond your area of expertise.	it to the water?
14	A Of what you just outlined, nothing.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form,
15	Q So within your area of expertise, why can't 11:09AM	mischaracterizes his testimony. 11:12AM
16	you grant that some of the defendants' phosphorus	A It wouldn't be very scientifically defensible
17	gets into the water?	to say that none of it did.
18	MR. McDANIEL: Bob, you are arguing with	MR. NANCE: Let's go ahead and change
19	the witness now. This is the tenth time on this	tapes.
20	question. 11:10AM	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now off the Record. 11:13AM
21	A I don't know where the phosphorus that's in	The time is 11:14 a.m.
22	any hypothetical runoff event that occurred in the	(Following a short recess at 11:14
23	watershed, where it originated. It could have been	a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 11:26
24	from fertilizer applied to that field. It could	a.m.)
25	have been from manure applied to that field. It 11:10AM	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record. 11:25AM
	82	84
		TI .: 1100
1	could have been from cattle manure applied to that	The time is 11:26 a.m.
2	field. I don't know.	Q Dr. Coale, to your knowledge, will any expert
3	Q My question isn't about fertilizer or cattle	on behalf of the defendants testify that none of the
4 5	manure. It's about chicken litter, chicken waste. A Uh-huh. 11:10AM	phosphorus from defendants' poultry waste makes it into the water of the Illinois River watershed? 11:25AM
5 6		
7	Q And knowing what you know about phosphorus	A I don't have any knowledge of that plan. I don't know.
8	transport and rainfall, don't you know that some of it gets in the water?	Q In your report, sir, Paragraph 5 is generally
9	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. Hold	entitled concern about high P soils. That starts on
10	on, Frank. If you keep asking this question time 11:10AM	Page 6. Do you see that? 11:26AM
11	and time again, I'm going to call the judge. He's	A Yes, I do.
12	answered the question and he's answered it. Now	Q What is the concern about high phosphorus
13	it's becoming oppressive, and you're just beating on	soils?
14	him, and I don't think it's appropriate. There will	A A general explanation is there's some concern
15	** *	•
	be a point at which I'm going to instruct him not to 11:10AM	that as soils become enriched, become high P by 11:26AM
16		that as soils become enriched, become high P by 11:26AM whatever definition there is for a high P soil, that
	answer and we'll call the judge.	
16	answer and we'll call the judge.	whatever definition there is for a high P soil, that
16 17	answer and we'll call the judge.  A When phosphorus is introduced into a soil,	whatever definition there is for a high P soil, that the potential for movement off site with runoff
16 17 18	answer and we'll call the judge.  A When phosphorus is introduced into a soil, regardless of where it originated from, it becomes	whatever definition there is for a high P soil, that the potential for movement off site with runoff water can be elevated.
16 17 18 19	answer and we'll call the judge.  A When phosphorus is introduced into a soil, regardless of where it originated from, it becomes part of the soil phosphorus pool. Okay? That soil	whatever definition there is for a high P soil, that the potential for movement off site with runoff water can be elevated.  Q And do we care about the potential for runoff
16 17 18 19 20	answer and we'll call the judge.  A When phosphorus is introduced into a soil, regardless of where it originated from, it becomes part of the soil phosphorus pool. Okay? That soil phosphorus in that that phosphorus in that soil 11:11AM	whatever definition there is for a high P soil, that the potential for movement off site with runoff water can be elevated.  Q And do we care about the potential for runoff from the site because it could have bad 11:26AM
16 17 18 19 20 21	answer and we'll call the judge.  A When phosphorus is introduced into a soil, regardless of where it originated from, it becomes part of the soil phosphorus pool. Okay? That soil phosphorus in that that phosphorus in that soil phosphorus is subject to being taken up by plants, being	whatever definition there is for a high P soil, that the potential for movement off site with runoff water can be elevated.  Q And do we care about the potential for runoff from the site because it could have bad environmental consequences?
16 17 18 19 20 21	answer and we'll call the judge.  A When phosphorus is introduced into a soil, regardless of where it originated from, it becomes part of the soil phosphorus pool. Okay? That soil phosphorus in that that phosphorus in that soil phosphorus in that that soil phosphorus in that you is subject to being taken up by plants, being fixed chemically or physically fixed within the soil, moving with soil water in lateral or vertical directions. When you measure phosphorus in runoff	whatever definition there is for a high P soil, that the potential for movement off site with runoff water can be elevated.  Q And do we care about the potential for runoff from the site because it could have bad environmental consequences?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A If the runoff reaches a water body, yes, it could.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	answer and we'll call the judge.  A When phosphorus is introduced into a soil, regardless of where it originated from, it becomes part of the soil phosphorus pool. Okay? That soil phosphorus in that that phosphorus in that soil phosphorus in that being taken up by plants, being fixed chemically or physically fixed within the soil, moving with soil water in lateral or vertical	whatever definition there is for a high P soil, that the potential for movement off site with runoff water can be elevated.  Q And do we care about the potential for runoff from the site because it could have bad environmental consequences?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A If the runoff reaches a water body, yes, it

1	often enough that we are, in fact, concerned about	say STP or soil test phosphorus.
2	it environmentally?	A That's a good point. Soil test phosphorus is
3	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	a laboratory method of measuring a certain quantity
4	A Yes, there is a concern.	of soil excuse me, a certain quantity of
5	Q But does runoff reach water enough that it 11:26AM	phosphorus in the soil to be used as a predictor for 11:30AM
6	give us a real concern?	phosphorus available for growing crops. There's
7	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	different ways of making that measurement.
8	A I believe it does.	Q Okay. Is phosphorus the limiting nutrient in
9	Q In your preparation let me take a short	the waters of the Illinois River watershed as
10	detour here, Dr. Coale. In your preparation to 11:27AM	regards algae growth? 11:30AM
11	testify, have you talked with anyone at an agency of	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's
12	the State of Oklahoma?	outside the scope of his report.
13	A Not that I'm aware.	A My general understanding is it is, but that's
14	Q Okay. Have you looked at any soil test data	definitely outside my area of expertise.
15	besides that that was used by Dr. Johnson, Gordon 11:27AM	Q Okay. Have you discussed that with any expert 11:30AM
16	Johnson?	for the defendants?
17	A I don't believe so.	A No, I haven't discussed any water body data at
18	Q Have you been made aware of the results of any	all.
19	environmental sampling conducted by the defendants?	Q Okay. Dr. Coale, have you reviewed any
20	A Can you define environmental sampling? 11:28AM	reports put out by the State of Oklahoma about water 11:31AM
21	Q Probably not. Any sampling, any test of the	quality in the Illinois River watershed?
22	environment whatsoever	A I believe I have reviewed reports. I don't
23	A No, no.	know who produced them. I don't recall that, but
24	Q by the defendants.	some general when I was first getting up to speed
25	A No. I haven't paid attention to it. If I've 11:28AM	on this whole situation, I read some background 11:31AM
	86	88
1	seen it, I've dismissed it.	information about what's going on in the watershed,
2	Q Okay. In Paragraph 5B on Page 6 you say that	and I don't recall who produced it.
3	it's important to remember that there's always some	Q Is that in the considered materials you sent
4	potential background level of P that may be	us with your report?
5	transported off field with field drainage water; do 11:28AM	A There probably I don't know is the bottom 11:31AM
6	vou see that?	line answer. If I didn't if that was just
7	A Yes, sir.	background information, I didn't consider it to be
8	Q And that would be true even if there had never	part of this report background.
9	been any commercial fertilizer or poultry waste	Q In Paragraph 5C you say that soil test P
10	applied to the field; right? 11:28AM	buildup and decline is not elastic. Could you tell 11:32AM
11	A True.	me what you mean by that?
12	Q Okay, and in any ecosystem that includes soil,	A What I meant by that is that oftentimes as you
13	there's no such thing as zero phosphorus discharge;	apply phosphorus to a soil to increase soil test P
14	is that right?	and then you stop applying, it doesn't come down at
15	A From my understanding, that's true. 11:29AM	the same rate it went up. 11:32AM
16	Q Okay. Dr. Coale, is there any circumstance	Q If you apply phosphorus to soil, the STP will
17	where land application of poultry waste would not	до ир?
18	elevate the STP?	A Correct.
19	A I'm trying to think of when you preface is	Q Okay. Is that true whether it's commercial
20	there any such thing, I'm trying to think of some 11:29AM	phosphorus or phosphorus from poultry waste? 11:32AM
21	unusual or manipulative situation, but I can't off	A That's true.
22	the top of my head. So I would say under normal	Q Okay. Okay. One of the things that Dr.
23	farm management application, no, the STP would go	Johnson said that you mention in Paragraph 5C is
24	up.	that it's about midway through the part that's on
25	Q Tell me very quickly what you mean when you 11:29AM	Page 6. Well, I'll get the whole sentence. 11:33AM
	87	89

1	A Okay.	A Summary of the results of several studies,
2	Q Dr. Gordon Johnson stated that historic	yes.
3	calibration studies determined that applied P that	Q Several studies. Are you aware of any such
4	is in excess of crop uptake will accumulate in the	studies that were done in the Illinois River
5	soil and raise the STP about one pound STP per acre 11:33AM	watershed? 11:36AM
6	for every ten to fifteen pounds of excess P205 per	A No, I'm not.
7	acre, and then you cite to his report.	Q Okay. Have you looked at studies relied upon
8	A Uh-huh.	by Dr. Johnson for his opinion that it goes down
9	Q Is that much of what Dr. Johnson said	about as fast as it comes up?
10	scientifically reasonable for the soils in the 11:33AM	A No. The only information I have from Dr. 11:36AM
11	Illinois River watershed?	Johnson was that one statement that in my
12	A I think that's being reasonable.	interpretation assumed it came down the same rate it
13	Q Okay. Now, you disagree about where he says a	went up.
14	little farther down, similarly, when no P is added,	Q Okay. Let's look at one of these studies that
15	an STP will decrease by about the same factor. Why 11:34AM	you participated in. Just a moment. Dr. Coale, let 11:36AM
16	do you disagree with it? First of all, do you	me hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 3 Coale
17	disagree with what he said there?	and copies to Mr. McDaniel. Is this one of the
18	A I disagree that you can assume that it's going	studies that you referred to in Paragraph 5C of your
19	to come down to the same rate.	report?
20	Q Okay, and why do you disagree with that? 11:34AM	A Yes, it is. 11:37AM
21	A I believe later on in that paragraph I gave	Q Could you pronounce the name of the lead
22	several citations to data that has been produced	author for me?
23	around various places in the country where it shows	A Kratochvil.
24	that the rate of decline of soil test P after you	Q Kratochvil, and you are the second author
25	stop adding new phosphorus to the system and 11:34AM	listed on this report; is that correct? 11:38AM
	90	92
1	continue to grow crops is really highly variable.	A Correct.
2	Sometimes it comes down quickly and sometimes it	Q So this is something that you did yourself;
3	doesn't move at all. It stays elevated at whatever	right?
4	rate it was when it started for many years, and that	A Right. Well, Dr. Kratochvil took the lead in
5	oftentimes that rate of decline is highly dependent 11:35AM	it, and I was the secondary. 11:38AM
6	on the historical treatment of that land. So to	Q Let's look at the what I'm going to call
7	assume that the soil test P level comes down at the	the summary there at the top of Page 117, the first
8	same rate it went up with fertilizer addition is	page of that report.
9	very simplistic, and I don't think it's reliable.	A Yes.
10	Q Okay. Are you familiar with the term 11:35AM	Q The very first sentence there, let me read it 11:38AM
11	phytoremediation?	and let's talk about it briefly. Eutrophication of
12	A Yes.	fresh water bodies is frequently attributed to
13	Q Tell me what that is, please.	elevated phosphorus concentrations in surface runoff
14	A That's the use of plants to aggressively	from P-enriched agricultural soils. Is that a true
15	reduce the concentration of usually a contaminant of 11:35AM	statement? 11:38AM
16	some sort in the soil.	A Yes.
17	Q Okay, and there have been studies, have there	Q Okay. Below where it says introduction, would
18	not, on phytoremediation on high phosphorus soils?	you read the first just the first sentence below
19	A Yes, there have.	introduction?
20	Q In fact, you've done at least one study on 11:35AM	A Starting many agricultural fields in 11:39AM
21	that subject yourself, haven't you?	concentrated livestock production regions throughout
22	A Yes, I have.	the world are characterized by soils that are highly
23	Q Okay, and was what you told me a minute ago	enriched in phosphorus as a result of either
24	about it being variable, kind of a summary of the	excessive manure application rates or long-term
25	results of those studies? 11:35AM	animal manure use. 11:39AM
	91	93

1	Q Okay. Obviously you agree with that because	A Correct.
2	that's in the report that you helped write; correct?	Q Okay. Next sentence, this limitation, and I
3	A Uh-huh, correct.	believe that's on P-based soils or P-based systems.
4	Q Would that be true for the soils in the	This limitation creates an economic hardship for
5	Illinois River watershed where poultry waste has 11:39AM	farmers who will be faced with purchasing chemical 11:42AN
6	been applied?	fertilizers to supply crops nitrogen and potassium
7	A I would suspect it is at some sites and maybe	requirements previously obtained with manure. What
8	not at all sites.	do you mean by that sentence, sir?
9	Q Okay, and you go on to say, as we've talked	A Well, if a farmer can no longer use litter or
10	about before, rates for manure application are 11:39AM	manure because it is deemed as a risk, the P level 11:43AM
11	typically based on nitrogen requirements for crops;	is too high, is deemed whatever the regulations
12	right?	they're working under, they can't apply litter
13	A Correct.	there, then he is going to have to purchase nitrogen
14	Q That was at least true back in whenever you	or potentially potassium fertilizer, which he
15	published this. Then there's a sentence a little 11:40AM	wouldn't have had to purchase in the past before 11:43AM
16	bit farther down that says, in these situations soil	that regulation limited his ability to apply litter.
17	P concentrations can increase rapidly, and it cites	Q The first sentence of the next paragraph says,
18	something that you wrote and something that Dr.	few practical options for reducing high soil P
19	Sharpley wrote; right?	concentrations are available. What are the options
20	A Okay, yes. 11:40AM	that are available for reducing high P soils? 11:43AM
21	Q And that's a true statement; right?	A Basically the only practical option is to grow
22	A Yes.	crops that remove it from the soil, and that takes a
23	Q Okay. Read the next sentence for me, if you	long time.
24	would, please.	Q Okay. On the next page, which is Page 119 in
25	A As soil P levels increase, the soluble P 11:40AM 94	the report, there's that small paragraph at the 96
1	concentration in runoff water typically increases.	bottom. Let me look at the sentence immediately
2	Q And it's referenced a bunch of people?	above that. Forage crops that may be produced on
3	A Right.	
		sites that are P enriched are you with me? I'm
4	Q And that's true as well; right?	sites that are P enriched are you with me? I'm sorry.
4 5	Q And that's true as well; right? A Yes. 11:40AM	_
	1 - ·	sorry.
5	A Yes. 11:40AM	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM
5 6	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P
5 6 7	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.	Sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the
5 6 7 8 9	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on
5 6 7 8 9	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find. MR. McDANIEL: Darned. MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again.
5 6 7 8 9 10	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph 11:41AM	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find. MR. McDANIEL: Darned. MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus 11:45AM
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus 11:45AM aggressively and I can't find the word on
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again be used as a crop nutrient source. Did I read that	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus aggressively and — I can't find the word — on purpose, trying to pull the phosphorus soil levels
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find. MR. McDANIEL: Darned. MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again be used as a crop nutrient source. Did I read that correctly?	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus 11:45AM aggressively and I can't find the word on purpose, trying to pull the phosphorus soil levels down and you are feeding that forage to animals,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again be used as a crop nutrient source. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, I believe you did.	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus 11:45AM aggressively and I can't find the word on purpose, trying to pull the phosphorus soil levels down and you are feeding that forage to animals, then the manure from those animals would be it
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find. MR. McDANIEL: Darned. MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again be used as a crop nutrient source. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, I believe you did.  Q Okay. Would that be true, as well, for soils 11:42AM	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus aggressively and I can't find the word on purpose, trying to pull the phosphorus soil levels down and you are feeding that forage to animals, then the manure from those animals would be it would be best served if your goal is to pull the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find. MR. McDANIEL: Darned. MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again be used as a crop nutrient source. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, I believe you did. Q Okay. Would that be true, as well, for soils 11:42AM where forages are grown?	sorry.  A Yes. 11:44AM  Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM  A Let me read it again.  Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus aggressively and I can't find the word on purpose, trying to pull the phosphorus soil levels down and you are feeding that forage to animals, then the manure from those animals would be it would be best served if your goal is to pull the phosphorus level as fast as you can. The manure
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again be used as a crop nutrient source. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, I believe you did. Q Okay. Would that be true, as well, for soils 11:42AM where forages are grown?  A Generally, yes, there's going to be some	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus 11:45AM aggressively and I can't find the word on purpose, trying to pull the phosphorus soil levels down and you are feeding that forage to animals, then the manure from those animals would be it would be best served if your goal is to pull the phosphorus level as fast as you can. The manure from those animals should not be redeposited on the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again be used as a crop nutrient source. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, I believe you did.  Q Okay. Would that be true, as well, for soils 11:42AM where forages are grown?  A Generally, yes, there's going to be some variability like I mentioned before.	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus aggressively and I can't find the word on purpose, trying to pull the phosphorus soil levels down and you are feeding that forage to animals, then the manure from those animals would be it would be best served if your goal is to pull the phosphorus level as fast as you can. The manure from those animals should not be redeposited on the same soil.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again be used as a crop nutrient source. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, I believe you did.  Q Okay. Would that be true, as well, for soils 11:42AM where forages are grown?  A Generally, yes, there's going to be some variability like I mentioned before.  Q Okay, but whether it goes down as fast as it	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus aggressively and I can't find the word on purpose, trying to pull the phosphorus soil levels down and you are feeding that forage to animals, then the manure from those animals would be it would be best served if your goal is to pull the phosphorus level as fast as you can. The manure from those animals should not be redeposited on the same soil. Q You're better off if you can remove the manure
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Yes. 11:40AM  Q Well, I've got a quote here I can't find.  MR. McDANIEL: Darned.  MR. NANCE: We'll find it.  Q Well, let me just ask you if this statement is true, that yeah, okay. Second complete paragraph just below midpoint of the page, unfortunately under agronomic production systems where grains are harvested, McCollum's findings indicate that many years and perhaps even decades will be required to effectively reduce soils that have excessive P 11:42AM concentrations to levels where manure can once again be used as a crop nutrient source. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, I believe you did.  Q Okay. Would that be true, as well, for soils 11:42AM where forages are grown?  A Generally, yes, there's going to be some variability like I mentioned before.	sorry. A Yes. 11:44AM Q Would only be considered a successful P remediation practice if the manure from the livestock fed these crops and was used only on fields that are not P enriched. What does that sentence mean, sir? 11:45AM A Let me read it again. Q Please do. Whatever you need to do. A I think it's a summary statement saying that if you are growing forage crops to actively remediate the phosphorus, reduce phosphorus aggressively and I can't find the word on purpose, trying to pull the phosphorus soil levels down and you are feeding that forage to animals, then the manure from those animals would be it would be best served if your goal is to pull the phosphorus level as fast as you can. The manure from those animals should not be redeposited on the same soil.

1	A Correct.	one coming?
2	Q Okay. Let me ask you just kind of a side	Q What does this table show?
3	question to that. If cattle are grazing on a	A Oh. I didn't know you were waiting for me.
4	pasture that hasn't been fertilized with either	Q I'm sorry.
5	commercial fertilizer or poultry litter 11:46AM	A Okay. Well, if you look down the first 11:49AM
6	A Uh-huh.	left-hand column, those are four different physical
7	Q does the waste the cattle deposits on the	locations, four different farms. The second column
8	field enrich the soil in phosphorus?	from the left, there's each farm there's a forage
9	A It really depends on your scope of reference.	system and grain production system in place at each
10	Q Okay. 11:46AM	farm, and those are defined more fully in the 11:49AM
11	A If there's no phosphorus entering the system,	footnotes, and then if you look at the major
12	there's no phosphorus being applied, then it's more	horizontal heading across the top of the table
13	of a recycling, okay, but what they can tend to do	Q Uh-huh.
14	is the forage crops take up phosphorus from within	A that was the rate that the manure was
15	that rooting zone of the soil from what shallow 11:46AM	applied to this site at the rate based at the rate 11:50AM
16	depth or deep depth, wherever the roots are, and	in units of kilograms P per hectare over years,
17	then put it into the tissue of the forage plants.	total load over four years that was applied. So the
18	The cattle eat it, and then what they defecate on	application to the site was either zero, 400
19	the soil will relocate some of that phosphorus from	kilograms P per hectare over four years, 800, 1,200,
20	within the roots of the soil onto the soil surface. 11:47AM	1,600. 11:50AM
21	Q Would it be fair to say that it moves	Q Okay. How big a unit of land is a hectare?
22	phosphorus around but doesn't add any phosphorus to	A Roughly two and a half acres.
23	the soil?	Q Okay. Then what do you have below that, sir?
24	A If there's no phosphorus coming from the	A That's the soil P concentration as in Mehlich
25	outside of that field 11:47 AM	III P in milligrams per kilograms, parts per 11:50AM
	98	100
1	Q Correct.	million.
1 2	Q Correct. A into that field, then it's just recycling	million.  Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the
2	A into that field, then it's just recycling	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the
2	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's
2 3 4	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed,	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to
2 3 4 5	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field. Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from 11:47AM	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre?
2 3 4 5 6	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field. Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre?  11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview,	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's 11:48AM	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's 11:48AM deposited.	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right.  Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A — into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls,	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two. Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right. Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A — into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's the watershed at different locations from where it's go would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that,	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two. Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right. Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre? A Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A — into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that, natural transport, not manmade transport?  11:48AM	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right.  Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre?  A Correct.  Q Okay. On Page 122, Dr. Coale, just below 11:51AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that, natural transport, not manmade transport?  11:48AM That's my understanding.	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right.  Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre?  A Correct.  Q Okay. On Page 122, Dr. Coale, just below 11:51AM in the results and discussion portion, the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A — into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that, natural transport, not manmade transport?  A That's my understanding.  Q Okay. Let's turn over to Page 121, Dr. Coale.	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right.  Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre?  A Correct.  Q Okay. On Page 122, Dr. Coale, just below 11:51AM in the results and discussion portion, the first sentence there says, the forage crop system
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that, natural transport, not manmade transport?  A That's my understanding.  Q Okay. Let's turn over to Page 121, Dr. Coale. This Table 2 at the top of the page A Yes, sir.  Q has something to do with soil phosphorus 11:48AM	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right.  Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre?  A Correct.  Q Okay. On Page 122, Dr. Coale, just below 11:51AM in the results and discussion portion, the first sentence there says, the forage crop system consistently removed more P from the harvested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A — into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that, natural transport, not manmade transport?  A That's my understanding.  Q Okay. Let's turn over to Page 121, Dr. Coale. This Table 2 at the top of the page — A Yes, sir.	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two. Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right. Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre? A Correct. Q Okay. On Page 122, Dr. Coale, just below 11:51AM in the results and discussion portion, the first sentence there says, the forage crop system consistently removed more P from the harvested forage crops than was removed by the harvested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that, natural transport, not manmade transport?  A That's my understanding.  Q Okay. Let's turn over to Page 121, Dr. Coale. This Table 2 at the top of the page A Yes, sir.  Q has something to do with soil phosphorus 11:48AM	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two. Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right. Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre? A Correct. Q Okay. On Page 122, Dr. Coale, just below—11:51AM in the results and discussion portion, the first sentence there says, the forage crop system consistently removed more P from the harvested forage crops than was removed by the harvested grains for the grain system across the five soil P 11:52AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A — into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else? A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited. Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that, natural transport, not manmade transport? A That's my understanding. Q Okay. Let's turn over to Page 121, Dr. Coale. This Table 2 at the top of the page — A Yes, sir. Q — has something to do with soil phosphorus concentrations. I just need you to help me	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two. Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right. Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre? A Correct. Q Okay. On Page 122, Dr. Coale, just below—11:51AM in the results and discussion portion, the first sentence there says, the forage crop system consistently removed more P from the harvested forage crops than was removed by the harvested grains for the grain system across the five soil P 11:52AM treatment at all locations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A — into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that, natural transport, not manmade transport?  A That's my understanding.  Q Okay. Let's turn over to Page 121, Dr. Coale. This Table 2 at the top of the page — A Yes, sir.  Q — has something to do with soil phosphorus concentrations. I just need you to help me understand this table a little better.	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right.  Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre?  A Correct.  Q Okay. On Page 122, Dr. Coale, just below 11:51AM in the results and discussion portion, the first sentence there says, the forage crop system consistently removed more P from the harvested forage crops than was removed by the harvested grains for the grain system across the five soil P 11:52AM treatment at all locations.  A Correct.  Q Does that mean that for phytoremediation, forages at least this study says forages are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A — into that field, then it's just recycling within the field.  Q Okay. Now, in the Illinois River watershed, to what extent is cattle manure removed from enriched phosphorus fields and used somewhere else?  A Again, based on a very cursory overview, understanding that detailed information, I don't believe much cattle manure is redistributed across the watershed at different locations from where it's deposited.  Q So would it be fair to say, in your understanding, most of it stays where it falls, subject to whatever transport happens after that, natural transport, not manmade transport?  A That's my understanding.  Q Okay. Let's turn over to Page 121, Dr. Coale. This Table 2 at the top of the page — A Yes, sir.  Q — has something to do with soil phosphorus concentrations. I just need you to help me understand this table a little better. A Okay. I'll do my best. It's been a while	Q Okay, and I think we discussed this at the hearing but I'm a pounds per acre guy. So what's the rule of thumb that would convert this unit to pounds per acre? 11:50AM  A Well, in Oklahoma it's times two.  Q Okay. So you would have had, at least in some of these STPs, up as high as, oh, I see 403 in the far right-hand column. That would be 403 milligrams per kilogram? 11:51AM  A Right.  Q And in Oklahoma that would be approximately 800 pounds per acre?  A Correct.  Q Okay. On Page 122, Dr. Coale, just below 11:51AM in the results and discussion portion, the first sentence there says, the forage crop system consistently removed more P from the harvested forage crops than was removed by the harvested grains for the grain system across the five soil P 11:52AM treatment at all locations.  A Correct.  Q Does that mean that for phytoremediation,

1	A Correct.	some instances with grain, the STP was higher?
2	Q Okay. In this study, did you remove the	A Yes.
3	forage or the hay from the site and take it	Q And forage systems, it was lower, 7 to 15
4	somewhere else after each crop?	percent?
5	A Yes. 11:52AM	A That's what it says, yes. 11:56AM
6	Q To what extent is that done in the pastures of	Q And bottom sentence in that paragraph, the
7	the Illinois River watershed?	year-to-year variation indicated that three years of
8	A Well, unless the pastureland is harvested for	elevation are not enough evaluation, excuse me,
9	hay and the hay is baled and taken off site, the	are not enough time to make any definitive
10	other scenario is it's just ingested by the cattle 11:52AM	prediction about how much it will take to remediate 11:56AM
11	and stays on the site.	P-enriched soils with either cropping system?
12	Q And it's recycled basically?	A Correct.
13	A Well, it goes into the mass of the animal and	Q So based on this study you did, it's going to
14	recycled on the site, whatever is not retained by	be at least more than three years?
15	the animal in its growth. 11:53AM	A Correct. 11:56AM
16	Q Okay. Do you know yourself what portion of	Q Okay. You averaged these results over four
17	the pastures in the Illinois River watershed with	locations. Was that statistically appropriate?
18	elevated STPs have hay removed from the site?	A I'm sure it was or we wouldn't have done it.
19	A No, I don't.	Q That's a good answer. You wouldn't do
20	Q Okay. Do you know if anyone for the defense 11:53AM	anything inappropriate, would you? 11:56AM
21	knows that?	A Not knowingly.
22	A Not that I'm aware of.	Q But use of an average, is that sometimes an
23	Q Let's go over to Page 126, sir. At the fourth	appropriate statistical tool?
24	complete paragraph, just about midway down, you	A Absolutely, absolutely.
25	found that no significant reductions in soil P 11:53AM	Q Okay. On Page 128, sir, in conclusions and 11:57AM
	102	104
1	concentrations were observed for the recipity 22	
1	concentrations were observed for the majority, 33	perspectives at the bottom, I guess it's the third
2	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down,
2	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down,
2	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study,
2 3 4 5 6	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  11:54AM A Yes, you did.	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected
2 3 4 5 6 7	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?
2 3 4 5 6	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly? 11:54AM A Yes, you did. Q What's that mean? A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40,	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly? A Yes, you did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly? 11:54AM A Yes, you did. Q What's that mean? A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly? A Yes, you did. Q What's that mean?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly? 11:54AM  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, 11:54AM	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly? A Yes, you did. Q What's that mean? A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly? 11:54AM  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, 11:54AM that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly? A Yes, you did. Q What's that mean? A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph,	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly? A Yes, you did. Q What's that mean? A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly? A Yes, you did. Q What's that mean? A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly? A Yes, you did. Q What's that mean? A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year period, 2001 to '04, the soil P concentration in the	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the system.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  11:54AM  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year period, 2001 to '04, the soil P concentration in the zero treatment level averaged over the four	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the system.  Q The next sentence says, there have been no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year period, 2001 to '04, the soil P concentration in the zero treatment level averaged over the four locations ranged from 12 percent less to 11 percent	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the system.  Q The next sentence says, there have been no consistent reductions in soil test P concentration
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops — crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year period, 2001 to '04, the soil P concentration in the zero treatment level averaged over the four locations ranged from 12 percent less to 11 percent greater than the 2001 or 2002 for one site baseline  11:55AM	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the system.  Q The next sentence says, there have been no consistent reductions in soil test P concentration using a forage crop system. So I guess that says 11:58AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year period, 2001 to '04, the soil P concentration in the zero treatment level averaged over the four locations ranged from 12 percent less to 11 percent greater than the 2001 or 2002 for one site baseline value for the grain system, and from 7 to 15 percent	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulated phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the system.  Q The next sentence says, there have been no consistent reductions in soil test P concentration using a forage crop system. So I guess that says 11:58AM the same thing another way?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year period, 2001 to '04, the soil P concentration in the zero treatment level averaged over the four locations ranged from 12 percent less to 11 percent greater than the 2001 or 2002 for one site baseline value for the grain system, and from 7 to 15 percent less than the 2001 baseline value for the forage	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulating phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the system.  Q The next sentence says, there have been no consistent reductions in soil test P concentration using a forage crop system. So I guess that says 11:58AM the same thing another way?  A Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year period, 2001 to '04, the soil P concentration in the zero treatment level averaged over the four locations ranged from 12 percent less to 11 percent greater than the 2001 or 2002 for one site baseline value for the grain system, and from 7 to 15 percent less than the 2001 baseline value for the forage system.	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulating phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the system.  Q The next sentence says, there have been no consistent reductions in soil test P concentration using a forage crop system. So I guess that says 11:58AM the same thing another way?  A Correct.  Q Okay. Last two sentences in that paragraph on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year period, 2001 to '04, the soil P concentration in the zero treatment level averaged over the four locations ranged from 12 percent less to 11 percent greater than the 2001 or 2002 for one site baseline value for the grain system, and from 7 to 15 percent less than the 2001 baseline value for the forage system.  A Uh-huh.	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulating phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the system.  Q The next sentence says, there have been no consistent reductions in soil test P concentration using a forage crop system. So I guess that says 11:58AM the same thing another way?  A Correct.  Q Okay. Last two sentences in that paragraph on Page 128, however, it will probably take many years
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	out of 40, of the soil P concentration comparisons for the period 2001-2004 across the five manure treatments and four locations for the two cropping systems. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That for most of the sites, 33 out of 40, where we had a comparison, that even though we grew crops crops and removed them from the system, that the soil phosphorus levels didn't decrease.  Q Okay. On Page 127 in that first paragraph, sir, you're talking about year-to-year variances here.  A Okay.  11:55AM  Q The second sentence, during the three-year period, 2001 to '04, the soil P concentration in the zero treatment level averaged over the four locations ranged from 12 percent less to 11 percent greater than the 2001 or 2002 for one site baseline value for the grain system, and from 7 to 15 percent less than the 2001 baseline value for the forage system.	sentence down there, fourth row down, line down, however, during the first three years of the study, changes in soil P concentration have not reflected the ability of forage production systems to 11:57AM accumulate and remove P from P-enriched fields. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's that mean?  A That even though these forage systems are 11:58AM accumulating phosphorus in the soil and that accumulating phosphorus in the tissue, it's being removed from the field. You don't see that reflected in a decline in soil P levels. The soil has the ability to maintain that elevated level even 11:58AM though you've taken the phosphorus out of the system.  Q The next sentence says, there have been no consistent reductions in soil test P concentration using a forage crop system. So I guess that says 11:58AM the same thing another way?  A Correct.  Q Okay. Last two sentences in that paragraph on

_			
1	considered optimum. This finding is in concurrence	Q Okay.	
2	with McCollum 1991.	MR. McDANIEL: It was actually an exhibit	
3	A Uh-huh.	to his deposition.	
4	Q Let's compare the time it takes to elevate the	Q What can you tell me about that article just	
5	STP with the time it takes to reduce it if you are 11:59AM	from your recollection, since I don't have a copy,	01:08PM
6	using litter applications.	the Coblentz article?	
7	A Okay.	A Been quite some time since I looked at it, but	
8	Q Does it take as long in terms of time to go up	basically looked at producing forage grasses, I	
9	as this indicates it may take to come down?	think Bermuda grass and fescue, and looked at soil	
10	A No. Generally the STP levels can be elevated 11:59AM	test phosphorus levels and the rate of soil test P	01:09PM
11	much more quickly than they come down.	decline over a number of years with continued	
12	Q Okay.	harvest of hay, and the different scenarios had	
13	MR. NANCE: It would be a good place for a	different rates of decline.	
14	lunch break.	Q Was there anything unusual about the	
15	MR. McDANIEL: It's your call. 11:59AM	conclusions of that article that's not, in general	01:09PM
16	MR. NANCE: Let's break until 1:00.	terms, consistent with the ones you cited?	
17	MR. McDANIEL: That's fine.	A No. They just had different situations, had	
18	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now off the Record.	different decline rates they predicted, and nothing	
19	The time is 12:00 p.m.	unusual about it.	
20	(Following a lunch recess at 12:00 p.m. 11:59AM	Q Okay. Tell me just in general terms what was	01:09PM
21	proceedings continued on the Record at 1:08 p.m.)	done in this Read article, which is Exhibit No. 4.	
22	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.	A This is where they looked at the again, it	
23	The time is 1:08 p.m.	was another they built up soil phosphorus levels	
24	Q Good afternoon, Dr. Coale. I think before we	using broiler litter and they looked at the decline	
25	broke, we were talking about phytoremediation and 01:07PM	1 0	01:10PM
	106	108	
1	reduction of high P soil.	must meet meet of the land. I think it was different	
1 2	A Right.	pretreatment of the land. I think it was different loading rates of phosphorus through litter for	
3	Q I'm going to skip, and you're going to not	several years, and STP declined with time with	
4	object, I think the McCollum article because I found	continued production, continued hay production off	
5	it very hard to read. 01:07PM	those sites. 01:10PM	
6	A Okay.	Q Okay. Let's look at the first page of that,	
7	Q So let's go to the Read article.	which is numbered 1492.	
8	A Are we finished with this?	A Uh-huh.	
9	Q Yes, at least for the time being. Let me show	Q The upper right-hand column, let me read a	
10	you what I've marked as Coale Exhibit No. 4 and see 01:07PM	,	
		sentence and let's talk about it for a moment.	01:10PM
11	if that is the Read article you referred to in your	sentence and let's talk about it for a moment.  Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than	01:10PM
11 12	if that is the Read article you referred to in your expert report.		01:10PM
	-	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than	01:10PM
12	expert report.	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda	01:10PM
12 13	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one,	01:10PM
12 13 14	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers $2002$	01:10PM
12 13 14 15	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific phytoremediation-type article specific to the IRW. 01:08PM	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers 2002 $A \qquad \text{Uh-huh.}$	01:10PM
12 13 14 15 16	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific phytoremediation-type article specific to the IRW. 01:08PM  Q Okay.  A There was one University of Arkansas publication, like Coblentz, that referred to removal	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers 2002  A Uh-huh.  Q soil P levels in many broiler farms are substantially greater than those required for optimum forage yield. Is that the situation that	01:10PM
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific phytoremediation-type article specific to the IRW. 01:08PM Q Okay.  A There was one University of Arkansas publication, like Coblentz, that referred to removal with pasture grasses in the IRW.	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers 2002  A Uh-huh.  Q soil P levels in many broiler farms are substantially greater than those required for	01:10PM
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific phytoremediation-type article specific to the IRW. 01:08PM  Q Okay.  A There was one University of Arkansas publication, like Coblentz, that referred to removal	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers 2002  A Uh-huh.  Q soil P levels in many broiler farms are substantially greater than those required for optimum forage yield. Is that the situation that we've discussed before; is it considered a true and accurate statement by you?  01:1	01:10PM
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific phytoremediation-type article specific to the IRW.  Ol:08PM  Okay.  A There was one University of Arkansas publication, like Coblentz, that referred to removal with pasture grasses in the IRW.  Okay. Spell the author's name as best you  ol:08PM  can.	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers 2002  A Uh-huh.  Q soil P levels in many broiler farms are substantially greater than those required for optimum forage yield. Is that the situation that we've discussed before; is it considered a true and accurate statement by you?  O1:14	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific phytoremediation-type article specific to the IRW. 01:08PM Q Okay.  A There was one University of Arkansas publication, like Coblentz, that referred to removal with pasture grasses in the IRW.  Q Okay. Spell the author's name as best you 01:08PM can.  A C-O-B-L-E-N-T-Z, approximately.	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers 2002  A Uh-huh.  Q soil P levels in many broiler farms are substantially greater than those required for optimum forage yield. Is that the situation that we've discussed before; is it considered a true and accurate statement by you?  Oli:1  A Yes.  Q Okay. Let's look same page the first full	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific phytoremediation-type article specific to the IRW. 01:08PM Q Okay.  A There was one University of Arkansas publication, like Coblentz, that referred to removal with pasture grasses in the IRW.  Q Okay. Spell the author's name as best you 01:08PM can.  A C-O-B-L-E-N-T-Z, approximately.  Q Is that I don't recall that being in	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers 2002  A Uh-huh.  Q soil P levels in many broiler farms are substantially greater than those required for optimum forage yield. Is that the situation that we've discussed before; is it considered a true and accurate statement by you?  Oli:1  A Yes.  Q Okay. Let's look same page the first full paragraph of the right-hand column. I'll read again	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific phytoremediation-type article specific to the IRW. 01:08PM Q Okay.  A There was one University of Arkansas publication, like Coblentz, that referred to removal with pasture grasses in the IRW.  Q Okay. Spell the author's name as best you 01:08PM can.  A C-O-B-L-E-N-T-Z, approximately.  Q Is that I don't recall that being in your	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers 2002  A Uh-huh.  Q soil P levels in many broiler farms are substantially greater than those required for optimum forage yield. Is that the situation that we've discussed before; is it considered a true and accurate statement by you?  Oli:1  A Yes.  Q Okay. Let's look same page the first full paragraph of the right-hand column. I'll read again another sentence and let's talk about it.	1PM
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	expert report.  A Yes, I think it is. I realized over lunch time you asked me a question about a specific phytoremediation-type article specific to the IRW. 01:08PM Q Okay.  A There was one University of Arkansas publication, like Coblentz, that referred to removal with pasture grasses in the IRW.  Q Okay. Spell the author's name as best you 01:08PM can.  A C-O-B-L-E-N-T-Z, approximately.  Q Is that I don't recall that being in	Because the N-P ratio of litter is much lower than the ratio N and P absorbed from the soil by Bermuda grass, parenthesis, two to one versus ten to one, Evers 2002  A Uh-huh.  Q soil P levels in many broiler farms are substantially greater than those required for optimum forage yield. Is that the situation that we've discussed before; is it considered a true and accurate statement by you?  Oli:1  A Yes.  Q Okay. Let's look same page the first full paragraph of the right-hand column. I'll read again	

1	them at a site remote to the source is an important	there's a higher concentration at the surface and as
2	component of soil P remediation, despite the fact	you go deeper, there's probably a lower
3	that P levels may be reduced slowly or remain	concentration of phosphorus.
4	unchanged, especially with continued manure	Q What is P sorption?
5	application, and it cites Pant 2004. Is that 01:11PM	A P sorption is how phosphorus held onto soil 01:15PM
6	consistent with what you all found about the need to	particles.
7	remove the hay from the site?	Q Okay. The next sentence says, increased P
8	A If you remove the hay from the site, then you	concentration in surface soil increases the
9	would expect the rate of remediation, the rate of	potential for P transport by runoff or leaching that
10	soil test phosphorus to climb and be faster. 01:12PM	may cause eutrophication. Why is that the case? 01:15PM
11	Q Okay. When we say remediation, is that	Well, is that the case first?
12	another word for remedy?	A Well, that sentence assumes that that runoff
13	A I think remedy is probably the root of the	or leaching is reaching a water body; it's connected
14	word.	to a water body where eutrophication can happen.
15	Q Okay. Does the if you're trying to remedy 01:12PM	Q Is that a reasonable assumption? 01:15PM
16	the situation, would you keep putting more litter on	A Sometimes it happens; sometimes it doesn't,
17	the field you're trying to remedy?	yes.
18	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	Q And then what is this emphasizing the
19	A If your goal is to reduce soil P levels as	surface of the soil because that's where the
20	dramatically as possible, then you would not want to  01:12PM	
21	be adding P to the system.	• • ·
		they both hit the surface?
22	Q Okay. Then several lines down below there it	A Correct.
23	says I think something that we've heard before.	Q Okay. Down in the last paragraph, sir, the
24	It's widely accepted that remediation of excess soil	last paragraph in that left-hand column about
25	P by crop removal is slow. 01:13PM	halfway down, it talks about options to remediate. 01:16PM
	110	112
1	A I got it.	It is wight after the Consists
_	11 1 501 11.	
2	O Same paragraph That's certainly a true	It's right after the Cox cite.
2	Q Same paragraph. That's certainly a true	A Uh-huh.
3	statement based on what we've talked about before?	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk
3 4	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.
3 4 5	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.
3 4 5 6	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test
3 4 5 6 7	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N
3 4 5 6 7 8	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant
3 4 5 6 7 8	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can 01:13PM	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay.  01:16PM
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can 01:13PM accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay.  Ol:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can 01:13PM accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay.  Ol:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can 01:13PM accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay.  Ol:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay. 01:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can ol:13PM accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please.  01:14PM	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay.  O1:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that  Okay.  O1:16PM
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  O Please.  O 1:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay. 01:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that 01:16PM phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please.  Ol:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at the soil surface, is logical. If you're not tilling	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay. 01:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that 01:16PM phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage grass species, needs to be growing robustly, so it's
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please.  Ol:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at the soil surface, is logical. If you're not tilling it in or doing anything to incorporate it into the	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay.  Ol:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that  Ol:16PM  phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage grass species, needs to be growing robustly, so it's going to need nitrogen additions so it can grow
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please.  Ol:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at the soil surface, is logical. If you're not tilling it in or doing anything to incorporate it into the soils, you are increasing the phosphorus	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay.  Ol:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that  Ol:16PM  phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage grass species, needs to be growing robustly, so it's going to need nitrogen additions so it can grow robustly and extract the maximum amount of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please. 01:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at the soil surface, is logical. If you're not tilling it in or doing anything to incorporate it into the soils, you are increasing the phosphorus concentration right at the surface of the soil. 01:14PM	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay.  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that 01:16PM phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage grass species, needs to be growing robustly, so it's going to need nitrogen additions so it can grow robustly and extract the maximum amount of phosphorus from the soil, and what they're saying is 01:17PM
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe. 01:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can 01:13PM accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please. 01:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at the soil surface, is logical. If you're not tilling it in or doing anything to incorporate it into the soils, you are increasing the phosphorus concentration right at the surface of the soil. 01:14PM  That makes sense. And the second part says lower P	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay. 01:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that 01:16PM phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage grass species, needs to be growing robustly, so it's going to need nitrogen additions so it can grow robustly and extract the maximum amount of phosphorus from the soil, and what they're saying is 01:17PM that those nitrogen additions probably shouldn't be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please.  Ol:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at the soil surface, is logical. If you're not tilling it in or doing anything to incorporate it into the soils, you are increasing the phosphorus concentration right at the surface of the soil.  Ol:14PM  That makes sense. And the second part says lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay. 01:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that 01:16PM phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage grass species, needs to be growing robustly, so it's going to need nitrogen additions so it can grow robustly and extract the maximum amount of phosphorus from the soil, and what they're saying is 01:17PM that those nitrogen additions probably shouldn't be from a manure source but should be from a phosphorus
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can ol:13PM accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please.  Ol:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at the soil surface, is logical. If you're not tilling it in or doing anything to incorporate it into the soils, you are increasing the phosphorus concentration right at the surface of the soil.  Ol:14PM  That makes sense. And the second part says lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with the deeper soil layers, which just means that your	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay. 01:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that 01:16PM phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage grass species, needs to be growing robustly, so it's going to need nitrogen additions so it can grow robustly and extract the maximum amount of phosphorus from the soil, and what they're saying is 01:17PM that those nitrogen additions probably shouldn't be from a manure source but should be from a phosphorus  I mean, nitrogen fertilizer source.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please.  Ol:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at the soil surface, is logical. If you're not tilling it in or doing anything to incorporate it into the soils, you are increasing the phosphorus concentration right at the surface of the soil.  Ol:14PM  That makes sense. And the second part says lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with the deeper soil layers, which just means that your continued practice like that, you develop a	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay.  O1:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that  O1:16PM  phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage grass species, needs to be growing robustly, so it's going to need nitrogen additions so it can grow robustly and extract the maximum amount of phosphorus from the soil, and what they're saying is  O1:17PM that those nitrogen additions probably shouldn't be from a manure source but should be from a phosphorus  I mean, nitrogen fertilizer source.  Q Okay. In that context, would it be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	statement based on what we've talked about before?  A Right. They referenced this same McCollum article I referenced I believe.  Ol:13PM  Q Okay. Let's turn the page and look at the upper left-hand column of Page 1493. I'll read the first sentence and then let's talk about it. A complicating factor with broiler litter is that applying it to soil without incorporation can ol:13PM accumulate P and lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with deeper soil layers, and it has a couple of references. What does that mean?  A Let me reread it, please.  Q Please.  Ol:14PM  A Okay. The first part of it, accumulating P at the soil surface, is logical. If you're not tilling it in or doing anything to incorporate it into the soils, you are increasing the phosphorus concentration right at the surface of the soil.  Ol:14PM  That makes sense. And the second part says lower P sorption at the soil surface compared with the deeper soil layers, which just means that your	A Uh-huh.  Q Let me read those one at a time and we'll talk about them because they've got a couple.  A Okay.  Q Producer options to remediate soils that test high in P include, one, substituting fertilizer N additions for broiler litter N to enhance plant growth and uptake of N and P.  A Okay. 01:16PM  Q We've talked around that, but could you explain to me what that means?  A Well, basically if you are trying to reduce soil phosphorus levels through phytoremediation as rapidly and dramatically as possible, that 01:16PM phtyoremediating plants, in this case, the forage grass species, needs to be growing robustly, so it's going to need nitrogen additions so it can grow robustly and extract the maximum amount of phosphorus from the soil, and what they're saying is 01:17PM that those nitrogen additions probably shouldn't be from a manure source but should be from a phosphorus  I mean, nitrogen fertilizer source.

1	phosphorus, self-defeating to your goal of	A Okay.
2	remediating as quickly as you can?	MR. McDANIEL: I just don't want you to be
3	A Yes. If your goal is to bring the soil P	rushed.
4	levels down as quickly as possible, you don't want	A All right. Let me I'm having trouble
5	to add phosphorus to it. 01:17PM	figuring who they, the reference there refers to. 01:20PM
6	Q Then the second option is, two, cessation of	MR. ELROD: Take seven hours if you want.
7	litter application and continued harvest and removal	A It may take that long to read it.
8	of forage biomass until soil test P returns to a	Q That would be a bit generous.
9	more acceptable level.	A Okay. I believe the understanding it says
10	A Uh-huh. 01:17PM	before manure is applied, meaning they can use that 01:20PM
11	Q Does that mean just simply stop putting more	information as part of the planting process.
12	on, more litter on?	Q Would it be fair to say knowing your Mehlich
13	A Yes. That's just what we mentioned before.	III STP will help you know whether or not as a to
14	Q Okay. Down at the very bottom of that column,	be proactive before resuming applications, that you
15	sir, still on Page 1493, it says talks about some 01:18PM	know when it's good to apply it again, apply litter 01:21PM
16	studies, but says their results of significant	again?
17	correlation between the concentration of soluble	A Well, I would suggest that the Mehlich III P
18	reactive P in runoff and M3P in soil samples, zero	soil test value is an important component of an
19	to fifteen-centimeter depth, suggest knowledge of	assessment, and that assessment may have many other
20	soil test P can be used to assess P runoff in 01:18PM	components like the P index does, but that's one of 01:21PM
21	pasture before manure is applied and thereby help a	the components that we use to assess when you should
22	grower be proactive about when to resume	apply litter and when you shouldn't.
23	applications of broiler litter. Is that a true	Q Okay. The next sentence, Dr. Coale, says
24	statement in your judgment?	several studies show soil test P is associated
25	A Let me go back over it again, please. 01:18PM	positively with P losses in runoff water and would, 01:21PM
23	114	116
		110
1	Q Sure.	therefore, be useful in risk assessment with
2	A At the work under the assumption, I'm not	references. Is that a correct sentence?
3	picking up real quickly, but that sentence starts	A Well, that sentence referenced a published
4	out but the results of significant correlation. I	piece of work, Sharpley 1995, so I'm assuming they
5	don't assuming they're referencing a previously 01:19PM	got that right out of there, but in general, if 01:22PM
6	cited study, which I presume they are, that showed a	we're talking about a correlation between two
7	correlation, a positive correlation between soluble	datasets, that there have been datasets published
8	reactive P and soil test P or Mehlich III P, then	where the soil test P is positively correlated with
9	that would be a true statement, if they're	P loss in runoff.
10	referencing that data of someone else. 01:19PM	Q Let's go back to your report, which is Exhibit 01:22PM
11	Q As a general matter, is there a positive	No. 1. You should still have it there. I'm looking
12	correlation between soluble reactive P and M	on Page 7, Dr. Coale.
13	Mehlich III P?	A Can I put this aside?
14	A Yes, generally.	Q Yes. You need to keep it there for the
15	Q Okay. Now, it says before manure is applied. 01:19PM	reporter. She'll want it at the end of the day. 01:22PM
16	Why is that significant in this context?	A I'm trying to keep my piles straight. Where
17	A There have been and, again, I'm trying to	are we looking again, sir?
18	piece together where they're referencing within	Q That top subparagraph, which is C from the
19	right in here.	previous page.
20	MR. McDANIEL: If you need to take time to 01:19PM	A On Page 6? 01:23PM
21	read, you take whatever time you need with that	Q No. It's top of Page 7. It carries over to
22	document	Page 7.
23	A Okay.	A Okay.
24	MR. McDANIEL: to be satisfied with your	Q You say there after citing all of these
25	answer. 01:19PM	articles? 01:23PM
	115	117

1	A Uh-huh.	steep. If you look at the data in that Reed paper
2	Q The kinetics of P soil excuse me, of soil P	we just talked about, it can be very steep to flat.
3	mineralization and dissolution, combined with the	So that means the rate is going to be very site
4	rate of P removal by crop harvest, will control the	specific, very soil specific, very specific be
5	rate of STP decline over time. 01:23PM	determined by how that land was treated in the past 01:26PM
6	A Uh-huh.	and how those different pools of phosphorus are
7	Q What do you mean by that sentence, sir?	exchanging with themselves in the soil. So it's
8	A That when you have a pool of phosphorus in the	assuming you have a constant linear rate of twelve
9	soil, that pool was divided up between phosphorus	pounds per acre declining over time. I think it's
10	which is physically and chemically adsorbed or 01:23PM	just not a reliable number. 01:26PM
11	attached to the solid phases of the soil. As	Q Have you developed any opinion on how long it
12	phosphorus is tied up in organic matter in the soil,	will take to bring down the high P soil, the high P
13	some of that organic matter is turns over, is	level in these soils in the Illinois River watershed
14	very dynamic. It degrades quickly and releases	by phytoremediation?
15	soluble P, and some of it is very resistant, and 01:24PM	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 01:26PM
16	there's also phosphorus which is dissolved in the	A No.
17	soil and water. So it's the rate of those	Q Do you know if anyone for the defendants has
18	transformations within those different pools of	done that?
19	phosphorus in the soil that one regulates the supply	A Not that I'm aware.
20	of phosphorus through the soil for uptake by these 01:24PM	Q Okay. In the next little subparagraph that's 01:26PM
21	remediating plants, and that will supply that. It	unlettered there, you say that the model derived by
22	also regulates how much phosphorus you will pick up	Dr. Johnson appears to be a pure academic exercise.
23	or will show up in the soil test P evaluation of the	Are you with me there?
23 24	soil.	A Yes.
25		
49	Q Is what you've just told me a general 01:24PM 118	Q What do you mean when you say that it was 01:27PM
	-	
1	description of the way phosphorus works in the soil	let's take these phrases one at a time. It wasn't
2	and with plants?	developed from physical data?
3	A Correct.	A Uh-huh.
4	Q Okay. Your next sentence says, thus, since	Q What do you mean by that?
5	the rate of STP declined when no additional P is 01:24PM	A Is that he applied the assumption that soil 01:27PM
		11 Is that he applied the assumption that son 01.2/11/1
6	added to the soil while crop harvest continues is	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as
6 7	added to the soil while crop harvest continues is unknown	11 1
	-	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as
7	unknown	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss
7 8 9	unknown A Uh-huh.	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem at least from his
7 8 9 10	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where
7 8 9 10 11	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites 01:25PM	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from.  01:27PM
7 8 9 10 11	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from.  Ol:27PM  Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for
7 8 9 10 11 12	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from.  O1:27PM  Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	unknown A Uh-huh.  Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown?	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM  Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown? A Well, my understanding of the soil test P	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he — the premise of that model was
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown? A Well, my understanding of the soil test P decline model that he presented in his report 01:25PM	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he — the premise of that model was the rate of decline. 01:28PM
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown? A Well, my understanding of the soil test P decline model that he presented in his report 01:25PM assumed the rate of decline was equal to the rate of	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he — the premise of that model was the rate of decline. 01:28PM Q Okay.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown? A Well, my understanding of the soil test P decline model that he presented in his report 01:25PM assumed the rate of decline was equal to the rate of elevation of soil test P with added fertilizer,	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he — the premise of that model was the rate of decline. 01:28PM Q Okay.  A And I think he imposed a constant rate of
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown? A Well, my understanding of the soil test P decline model that he presented in his report 01:25PM assumed the rate of decline was equal to the rate of elevation of soil test P with added fertilizer, which was twelve roughly, I think ten to fifteen, I	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he the premise of that model was the rate of decline. 01:28PM Q Okay.  A And I think he imposed a constant rate of decline that I couldn't determine where he got that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown? A Well, my understanding of the soil test P decline model that he presented in his report 01:25PM assumed the rate of decline was equal to the rate of elevation of soil test P with added fertilizer, which was twelve roughly, I think ten to fifteen, I think an average of 12 pounds per acre per year, and	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he the premise of that model was the rate of decline. 01:28PM Q Okay.  A And I think he imposed a constant rate of decline that I couldn't determine where he got that from, other than that single assumption.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	unknown A Uh-huh. Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown? A Well, my understanding of the soil test P decline model that he presented in his report assumed the rate of decline was equal to the rate of elevation of soil test P with added fertilizer, which was twelve roughly, I think ten to fifteen, I think an average of 12 pounds per acre per year, and he used that as a constant linear decline rate, and 01:25PM	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he — the premise of that model was the rate of decline. 01:28PM Q Okay.  A And I think he imposed a constant rate of decline that I couldn't determine where he got that from, other than that single assumption.  Q Okay. The next thing you say, it was not 01:28PM
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	unknown A Uh-huh.  Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown?  A Well, my understanding of the soil test P decline model that he presented in his report of leevation of soil test P with added fertilizer, which was twelve roughly, I think ten to fifteen, I think an average of 12 pounds per acre per year, and he used that as a constant linear decline rate, and 1 gave a couple of 01:25PM	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he — the premise of that model was the rate of decline. 01:28PM Q Okay.  A And I think he imposed a constant rate of decline that I couldn't determine where he got that from, other than that single assumption.  Q Okay. The next thing you say, it was not 01:28PM validated by independent datasets. What do you mean
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	unknown A Uh-huh.  Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown?  A Well, my understanding of the soil test P decline model that he presented in his report of elevation of soil test P with added fertilizer, which was twelve roughly, I think ten to fifteen, I think an average of 12 pounds per acre per year, and he used that as a constant linear decline rate, and I was my whole point was, and I gave a couple of these references here, to show that that rate of	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he — the premise of that model was the rate of decline. 01:28PM Q Okay.  A And I think he imposed a constant rate of decline that I couldn't determine where he got that from, other than that single assumption.  Q Okay. The next thing you say, it was not 01:28PM validated by independent datasets. What do you mean by that?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	unknown A Uh-huh.  Q the hypothetical model of STP decline over time that was developed by Dr. Johnson, and it cites his report, is not quantitatively defensible and has no apparent application. Why do you say the rate of decline is unknown?  A Well, my understanding of the soil test P decline model that he presented in his report of levation of soil test P with added fertilizer, which was twelve roughly, I think ten to fifteen, I think an average of 12 pounds per acre per year, and he used that as a constant linear decline rate, and I was my whole point was, and I gave a couple of these references here, to show that that rate of decline can be all over the board. It can be almost	test phosphorus levels declined at the same rate as they are increased, that twelve pounds per acre loss rate. Didn't seem — at least from his presentation, I saw no data that supported where that twelve pound per acre rate came from. 01:27PM Q Are you saying that he didn't have data for his beginning point based on the STPs in the watershed?  A No. What he — the premise of that model was the rate of decline. 01:28PM Q Okay.  A And I think he imposed a constant rate of decline that I couldn't determine where he got that from, other than that single assumption.  Q Okay. The next thing you say, it was not 01:28PM validated by independent datasets. What do you mean by that?  A Well, bear in mind, I'm not a modeler and

1	you usually take a dataset and develop your model	Illinois River watershed that has elevated
2	and your parameters. For like this case we're	phosphorus is without an active pathway to water?
3	talking about now, you would take a dataset and from	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
4	that dataset, you would develop that rate of	A No, I don't.
5	decline, which Johnson assumed was twelve. So you 01:28PM	Q Do you know if anyone from the defendants is 01:32PM
6	take that dataset to develop your model, and then	prepared to speak to that?
7	you would go out and collect another dataset to see	A I don't know that.
8	whether the model you developed actually predicted	Q Okay. What would a piece of land without an
9	what you saw in real world, and if your model that	active pathway be? Just give me an example.
10	you came up with using a separate dataset accurately 01:29PM	A If you had a field that this is a crystal 01:32PM
11	predicted an independent dataset, then you can say	clear example. If you had a field that had a
12	that your model is validated, and I didn't see where	concave basin so water could potentially drain off
13	that took place.	that field over the surface and reach a point where
14	Q Then what do you mean when you say it has no	it would actually accumulate or be retained and
15	predicted capacity? 01:29PM	wouldn't, if you would, make it over the next hump 01:32PM
16	A Well, if you develop a model and the	and down the hill, that would be not an active
17	assumptions in the model back to that twelve linear	pathway.
18	coefficient of decline, if you develop a model based	•
19	• • •	Q Are there any other kinds of situations that
20	on a dataset and you can't demonstrate that that model predicts an independent dataset, then that 01:29PM	we might find in the Illinois River watershed that don't have an active pathway? 01:33PM
21	r	
	model can't be used to predict have predictive	A Sure. You can have runoff water as generated from one field, which may, in surface flow, exit
22	capacity. In other words, it has you can't use	
23 24	it to speculate what might happen in a hypothetical	that field and go into an adjacent field, which at
	situation. O Okav. 01:29PM	that point it may run across a different set of
25	Q Okay. 01:29PM 122	physical conditions in the soil, where you may have 01:33PM 124
	122	124
1	MR. NANCE: Let's go ahead and take a quick	infiltration in the soil, and the runoff path may be
2	break just to change the tape.	attenuated at that point, or you may have runoff
3	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the Record. The	from a field that reaches the edge of field, and if
4	time is 1:31 p.m.	the edge of the field is a wood lot, it may go into
5	(Whereupon, a discussion was held off 01:30PM	that area and then disperse and infiltrate into the 01:33PM
6	the Record.)	soil.
7	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.	Q Did you say a wood lot?
8	The time is 1:31 p.m.	A Yeah, a wooded area.
9	Q Dr. Coale, in Subparagraph E on Page 7	Q Okay.
10	A Yes, sir. 01:30PM	A Sorry. A wooded area. 01:33PM
11	Q you say, second sentence, in order for P	Q Okay.
12	losses from an agricultural field to be of	A So, yes, it did run off the field, and maybe
13	heightened ecological concern, the site must contain	it ran into a wooded area, and in that situation
14	both a substantial source of P and active pathways	surface soil conditions change, et cetera. It may
15	through which the P can be transported to an 01:31PM	infiltrate and no longer be runoff. So there's 01:33PM
16	adjacent body of water. Can you tell me what you	different scenarios where you may have runoff water
17	mean when you say an active pathway?	generated on a field but it's not connected to a
18	A That there has to be a mechanism, which is	water body.
19	usually water, to move phosphorus from the source to	Q If there's runoff water from a field and it's
20	a body of water. That pathway, whether it's surface 01:31PM	carrying with it some dissolved phosphorus 01:34PM
21	overland flow or what have you, you have to have	A Yes.
22	an active pathway has to be open and continuous and	Q what happens to the phosphorus if that
23	connected to that body of water so that it actually	water sinks into the ground before it gets to a
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
24	has an impact on that body of water.	stream?
24 25	has an impact on that body of water.  O Sir, do you know how much of the land in the 01:31PM	
	•	

1	water will go into the soil, infiltrate in the soil,	Q If there's uninterrupted flow from the top
2	and once water is moving through a soil, that	field to the water?
3	phosphorus that is dissolved in that water	A It may make it there or it may not.
4	oftentimes adsorbs chemically onto clays, adsorbed	Q Okay. If Field No. 1 is a high P field where
5	into organic water, or if the soil happens to be 01:34PM	litter has been applied and Field No. 2 is not, does 01:37PM
6	very shallow and reaches a place where it's an	that dissolved phosphorus that moves from Field 1 to
7	outlet site, it may seep back out and continue on	Field 2 in some way increase the STP of Field 2?
8	its way, so it may be many different fates. It	A It may.
9	really depends on the site and the soil conditions	Q Okay. Through the same mechanisms that you've
10	that are going on at that particular site. 01:35PM	talked about? 01:37PM
11	Q If it if the soil is shallow and it gets	A Right.
12	into somewhere and leaks back out, is that something	Q Is there anything other than a physical
13	that happens in the Karst geology in the Illinois	barrier if there's an uninterrupted slope from
14	River watershed?	Field 1 to the water
15	A From my understanding of Karst, yes, it can. 01:35PM	A Uh-huh. 01:38PM
16	Q Am I understanding correctly that if that	Q is there anything other than a physical
17	phosphorus moves from a higher field to the next	barrier that will stop the long-term movement of
18	lower field and sinks in, that the dissolved	that phosphorus from Field 1 to the water?
19	phosphorus just acts like phosphorus there and goes	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
20	through the same chemical processes that you've 01:35PM	A Well, given that scenario you outlined, there 01:38PM
21	described?	could be chemical barriers. The soil could be
22	A If it's dissolved in the soil water and it	amended or I suspect if there's a radical difference
23	infiltrates in the soil of a different field, then,	in the soil type, it could be a naturally occurring
24	yes, it's prone to be accumulated onto the solid	chemical where soluble P was generated at the higher
25	phases of the soil by adsorption. It can be fixed 01:35PM	elevations of Field 1 or Field 2. As it moved on 01:38PM
	126	128
1 2 3 4 5	by iron, aluminum or calcium if you know the pH. It can be incorporated into organic matter. So there's a lot of different fates.  Q Is that the same process basically that happens when you apply litter on, say, the first 01:36PM	way down the slope, it encountered either a purposefully constructed chemical barrier, in other words, you added something to the soil to trap phosphorus or a radically different soil type change where there was a high phosphorus adsorption  01:38PM
6	field?	capacity of that soil down, further down the slope.
7	A Yes, same process.	Then as that soluble phosphorus made its way down
8	Q The same sort of thing happens?	the slope and it hit that chemical barrier, it could
9	A Same processes.	be adsorbed into the soil and then no longer
10	Q Okay. What happens when it rains again? 01:36PM	available for continuing to move down the slope with 01:38PM
11	A On that second field, the lower field?	the drainage water.
12	Q On the second field.	Q What sort of chemical would might
13	A Well, it really depends. It would depend	deliberately be put in that pathway to stop the
14	Q If there's runoff water.	phosphorus?
15	A If there's runoff water generated, then it 01:36PM	A Well, we've played around with some of them, 01:39PM
16	really depends. If there's enough what load, if	and it's iron compounds, calcium compounds, aluminum
17	you will, of soluble P is in the soil water, whether	compounds. Depends on the pH of the soil and what
18	that moved with the water or not, and what	you are trying to accomplish, but there's ways to do
19	concentration depends on how much soil water	it.
20	soluble soil P there is at that site at that time. 01:36PM	Q Okay. What naturally occurring soil, 01:39PM
21	Q Well, does it some of it go into solution	different soil type might have the same effect?
22	and move to the third field down?	A Well, if you it's if you had a radical
23	A Some will.	shift in pH in the soil, for example, or you had a
24	Q Okay, and eventually to a stream or a river?	radically increasing clay content of the soil and
25	A It can or could not. Depends on the site. 01:36PM	that runoff water became in contact with it, it 01:39PM
	127	129

		1	
1	could absorb the phosphorus out of the soil.	from the water?	
2	Q To what extent in the Illinois River watershed	A With varying degrees of effectiveness, yes.	
3	are there radical differences in pH or clay content	Q In, I guess, it's 5F at the bottom of Page 7,	
4	like you've described?	Dr. Coale, you talk about the difficulties Dr. Olsen	
5	A That I don't know. 01:39PM	had in capturing edge of field runoff.	01:43PM
6	Q Does anyone who will testify for the	A Right.	
7	defendants to your knowledge know about such radical	Q Is there an established protocol for catching	
8	changes in soil pH or clay?	edge of field runoff?	
9	A I don't know. I haven't discussed that with	A Not that I know of.	
10	anybody. I don't know. 01:40PM	Q And 5G, which is on the top of Page 8, you're	01:43PM
11	Q Okay. Is there anything besides a deliberate	talking about, I guess, Dr. Fisher and Dr. Olsen's	
12	amendment of the soil like you've described or the	comments about the Karst geology.	
13	kind of different soil compositions like you've	A Uh-huh.	
14	described that and a physical barrier	Q You say that, about four lines down, the soil	
15	A Right. 01:40PM	surface slope, soil textural composition, talk about	01:43PM
16	Q that would stop the progress of phosphorus	percentage of sand, silt and clay.	011101111
17	from the high Field 1 to the stream?	A Uh-huh.	
18	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	Q Depth, bulk density and porosity of the soil	
19	A Well, of course, if you had a change in	that overlies the fractured limestone bedrock will	
20	topography so you no longer had a gravity gradient, 01:40PM	determine runoff, infiltration and percolation	01:44PM
21			01. <del>14</del> 1 W
22	it would stop it. It would accumulate at whatever	potential of rainfall that falls on a particular site.	
23	the low spot was.		
24	Q Okay, and I'm assuming an uninterrupted. I	A Uh-huh.	
25	realize if there's a dam or something or a hole?  A Or something uphill. 01:40PM	Q Have you done any particular studies of those	01:44PM
49	A Or something uphill. 01:40PM	factors in the IRW that would prepare you to opine	01;44PM
	130	132	
1	Q Right.	about the extent of percolation or infiltration of	
2	A Okay.	water?	
3	Q Can you think of anything other than the	A No, I have not.	
4	things we've talked about so far?	Q Do you know of anyone who's done that for the	
5	A For blocking soluble P, no, sir. 01:41PM	defendant? 01:44PM	
6	Q Okay. What about particulate P?	A No, I don't.	
7	A That's why I asked that question. Particulate	Q Just a second. In 7H you begin to talk about	
8	P, yes, there are physical barriers in the form of	assessment of potential P losses.	
9	vegetation.	A Uh-huh.	
10		I A Uli-liuli.	
TO	O Okay. 01:41PM		01:46PM
10 11	Q Okay. 01:41PM  A Would block the transport of physical P or	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit	01:46PM
10 11 12	Q Okay. 01:41PM  A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of		01:46PM
11	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to	01:46PM
11 12	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.	01:46PM
11 12 13 14	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later.	01:46PM 01:46PM
11 12 13	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later.  Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles	
11 12 13 14	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at 01:41PM	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later.  Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?	
11 12 13 14 15	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at it.  A It would be too small to see.	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later.  Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?  A Yes.	
11 12 13 14 15 16	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at it.  A It would be too small to see.  Q Is it like would it look like dirt that	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later. Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?  A Yes. Q Have you got a cough drop? You want a	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at it.  A It would be too small to see.  Q Is it like would it look like dirt that washes off a field or just erosion?	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later. Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?  A Yes. Q Have you got a cough drop? You want a peppermint or something? A I'm fine.	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at it.  A It would be too small to see. Q Is it like would it look like dirt that washes off a field or just erosion?  A It would look like muddy water. 01:41PM	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later. Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?  A Yes. Q Have you got a cough drop? You want a peppermint or something? A I'm fine.	01:46PM
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at it.  A It would be too small to see.  Q Is it like would it look like dirt that washes off a field or just erosion?  A It would look like muddy water. 01:41PM  Q Muddy water, okay, and am I hearing you	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later.  Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?  A Yes.  Q Have you got a cough drop? You want a peppermint or something?  A I'm fine.  Q Looking at the left-hand column there of the first page, which is I'm not sure of the number,	01:46PM
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at it.  A It would be too small to see.  Q Is it like would it look like dirt that washes off a field or just erosion?  A It would look like muddy water. 01:41PM  Q Muddy water, okay, and am I hearing you correctly that vegetation may filter out the mud	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later.  Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?  A Yes.  Q Have you got a cough drop? You want a peppermint or something?  A I'm fine.  Q Looking at the left-hand column there of the first page, which is I'm not sure of the number, but it's the first page of the article, about	01:46PM
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at it.  A It would be too small to see.  Q Is it like would it look like dirt that washes off a field or just erosion?  A It would look like muddy water. 01:41PM  Q Muddy water, okay, and am I hearing you correctly that vegetation may filter out the mud from the water?	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later.  Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?  A Yes.  Q Have you got a cough drop? You want a peppermint or something?  A I'm fine.  Q Looking at the left-hand column there of the first page, which is I'm not sure of the number, but it's the first page of the article, about halfway down that first paragraph, let me read the	01:46PM
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at it.  A It would be too small to see.  Q Is it like would it look like dirt that washes off a field or just erosion?  A It would look like muddy water. 01:41PM  Q Muddy water, okay, and am I hearing you correctly that vegetation may filter out the mud from the water?  A It can, yes.	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later.  Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?  A Yes.  Q Have you got a cough drop? You want a peppermint or something?  A I'm fine.  Q Looking at the left-hand column there of the first page, which is I'm not sure of the number, but it's the first page of the article, about halfway down that first paragraph, let me read the sentence and let's talk about it. In fact, US EPA,	01:46PM
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Would block the transport of physical P or particulate P due to just the physical blocking of particles moving.  Q Describe, when we talk about particulate phosphorus, what would it look like if we looked at it.  A It would be too small to see.  Q Is it like would it look like dirt that washes off a field or just erosion?  A It would look like muddy water. 01:41PM  Q Muddy water, okay, and am I hearing you correctly that vegetation may filter out the mud from the water?	Q Let me hand you what I have marked as Exhibit 5 for Coale. I guess if I say I'm handing it to you, I better hand it to you.  A I thought it would come sooner or later.  Q Do you recognize this as one of the articles you have referenced in Subparagraph H?  A Yes.  Q Have you got a cough drop? You want a peppermint or something?  A I'm fine.  Q Looking at the left-hand column there of the first page, which is I'm not sure of the number, but it's the first page of the article, about halfway down that first paragraph, let me read the	01:46PM 01:46PM

1	problem in most surface waters having impaired water	Q This seems to me to be a highly studied
2	quality with agriculture being the major source of	watershed?
3	causative nutrients in 50 percent of the lakes and	A It's very I've been there. It's a very
4	60 percent of the river miles determined to have	highly studied watershed.
5	impaired water quality. Did I read that correctly? 01:47PM	Q What's it like there? 01:50PM
6	A Yes, you did.	A In what regard?
7	Q So would it be fair to say that people in your	Q Just, I mean, what sort of facilities do they
8	profession have probably known since at least '96	use to study it?
9	about this problem and the role of agriculture in	A There are wells in the soil collecting soil
10	it? 01:47PM	water. There's surface runoff flumes. There's 01:50PM
11	A I don't want any confusion that I work for the	stream gauges. There's other instrumentation that I
12	EPA, and EPA is very different from scientists.	
13	They're regulators. Okay?	don't recall the purpose but soil water monitoring instrumentation across the watershed.
14		
15	Q Okay.  A So, yes, this references the EPA publication. 01:48PM	Q Okay.  A It's a very highly instrumented site. 01:51PM
	1	, , ,
16	Q All right. Do you think this sentence is generally accurate?	Q How does it compare in size to the Illinois
17		River watershed?
18	A I believe it's accurate.	A Oh, it's quite small. It's a small research
19	Q Okay. Do you know of any reason why in the	study site.
20	Illinois River watershed agriculture would not be a 01:48PM	Q Okay. How do the soils there compare to the 01:51PM
21	major source of causative nutrients of any	soils in the Illinois River watershed?
22	eutrophication in the water?	A I've never compared them. I don't know.
23	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's	Q What kind of soils do we have in the Illinois
24	outside the scope of his opinions offered in his	River watershed?
25	report. 01:48PM	A By name? I don't really know the names. 01:51PM
	134	136
1	A Torollo on act annual to comment on	The same of the same and of the same in th
1	A I really am not prepared to comment on	There are silt loams and silty soils. There's a
2	eutrophication in waterways of waters within the	wide variety.
3 4	IRW.	Q Okay. How does the elevation change in
<del>1</del> 5	Q What's your understanding generally of the	watershed either WE-38 or FD-36 compare to the elevation change in the Illinois River watershed? 01:52PM
6	effect of nutrients on eutrophication of waterways? 01:49PM	
7	A That the generally for fresh water systems, the eutrophication cycle, which is the growth of	A I don't know I don't think I can answer
8	algae above what ecologists seem deem to be	that question.  Q Okay. Let's turn to Page 272, if we could,
9	acceptable levels, is fueled by nutrients injected	Q Okay. Let's turn to Page 272, if we could, Dr. Coale. I need to understand some things it
10	into that system. 01:49PM	says. There in the right-hand column above the 01:52PM
11		
12	Q And would phosphorus be one of those nutrients generally?	runoff soil phosphorus interaction heading, the paragraph above that
13	A Generally phosphorus is one.	A Okay.
14	Q Now, this study, Exhibit No. 5, was done on a	Q the first sentence of that says comparisons
15	small watershed in Pennsylvania; is that right? 01:49PM	of calculated and measured flow volumes both at the 01:52PM
16	A If my recollection is correct I'll have to	runoff plot and whole site scale support the
17	see which one this is. Hang on a second, please.	assumption that storm runoff is generated primarily
18	Q Sure.	by the near-stream surface-saturated areas. Could
19	A Yes. It's saying the FD-36 watershed is one	you explain to me what that means?
20	of them. 01:50PM	A Interpreting those terms is that the near 01:53PM
21	Q Okay, and you're looking on Page 268?	stream it says where the runoff water is
22	A Yes, sir.	generated from within the site. So runoff was more
23	Q And it's got a little map of the watershed or	common to be generated near the stream, near the
24	a diagram of the watershed there; right?	creek in that stream where the surface soil becomes
25	A Yes, sir. 01:50PM	saturated with water. 01:53PM
	135	137

			1
1	Q Okay. Would I have it correctly if it rained		MR. HAMMONS: I figured there's an air
2	over the whole watershed uniformly		block on that side.
3	A Right.		MR. ELROD: You'll be asleep in about ten
4	Q that most of the water that would be in the		seconds.
5	stream would be from the rain that fell near the	01:53PM	A Where does that leave me? 01:56PM
6	stream?		MR. McDANIEL: Leaves you sleeping on the
7	A Most of the water that reached the stream by		desk.
8	runoff would be generated		MR. ELROD: Exactly. When you wake up,
9	Q By runoff, yeah.		you'll have no memory of this.
10	A would be generated from the regions that	01:53PM	MR. McDANIEL: But a good transcript.
11	are nearer the stream as opposed to regions further	*	A Excuse me. I'm going to suck on one of these.
12	from the stream.		If it becomes a problem, please let me
13	Q Okay. Would it then be fair to say that more		Q It certainly doesn't bother me.
14	of the phosphorus in the runoff would originate from		A Okay.
15	the land near the stream than from the land farther	01:54PM	Q Are you aware of any comparable study in the 01:57PM
16	from the stream?	V210 12112	Illinois River watershed that tailors the
17	A Well, if most of the runoff water is generated		appropriate distance from a stream for that
18	in the stream and you have to make an assumption		watershed?
19	about phosphorus concentrations, they're uniform,		A No, I've not seen that.
20	then most of the phosphorus runoff would be	01:54PM	Q Okay. So in your profession, do you just use 01:57PM
21	generated with that runoff water near the stream.	01.5 11 111	the 30 meters because that's the one that happened
22	Q All right. The next sentence says, most		to be in this watershed?
23	importantly, though, from the perspective of		A Yes, and, like I said before, it kind of
24	potential for P transport, the maximum extent of the		conforms with observation, but this is a good
25	surface runoff producing areas for all observed	01:55PM	dataset to back up that observation. 01:57PM
	138	01.551141	140
			110
1	storms was within approximately 30 meters of the		Q Does that mean that, going back to our earlier
2	channel.		example with high Field 1, that you would expect
3	A Uh-huh.		water to run off it 30 meters if there were runoff?
4	Q So is that why in your phosphorus indices		A I don't know if I understand that question.
5	you're concerned about nearness to a stream	01:55PM	Q Okay. You say in this study that you get most 01:57PM
6	A Right.		of your runoff from 30 meters from the stream.
7	Q as one of the factors?		A Right.
8	A That's part of it, yes.		Q We talked earlier about the high P Field 1,
9	Q Okay. Is it is that 30-meter figure		Field 2, Field 3 going down to a stream.
10	something that's unique to this particular watershed	01:55PM	A Right. 01:58PM
11	and not something you translate uniformly to every		Q Does that mean that it's a good rule of thumb
12	other watershed in the world?		that if it rains on Field 1 up high and there's
13	A That's kind of that's a they have a good		runoff, that the runoff is going to go about 30
14	dataset here to show that 30 meters is a reasonable		meters?
15	delineation, and it conforms with common practice	01:56PM	A No. 01:58PM
16	that you kind of know the further but we never		Q Why is that?
17	had a dataset to back that up. So it's been kind of		A Because in Field 1 up high in your scenario,
18	adopted as the limit because this dataset basically		there's no stream. The stream is way down here in
19	supports what in practice has been observed.		Field 3 or 4, correct, so, no, that wouldn't mean
20	MR. ELROD: Are we about to explode?	01:56PM	the same thing. 01:58PM
21	MR. NANCE: We're going to take off.		Q And why is that?
22			A D
	MR. HAMMONS: Is that gas fixing to come		A Because if you have a surface water stream,
23	out of the ceiling?		then you there's at least a local water table
23 24	out of the ceiling?  MR. McDANIEL: Only on that side of the		then you there's at least a local water table there at the stream surface.
23	out of the ceiling?		then you there's at least a local water table

1	A So that's what is controlling that distance	Q Well, let me read the sentence again and see
2	from the stream.	if you
3	Q And does that mean because the water table is	A Okay.
4	maybe near the surface, it's less likely water is	Q This suggests not applying P to those areas,
5	less likely to sink in? 01:58PM	meaning the 60 percent where it's over the level 02:02PM
6	A Correct, correct.	A Uh-huh.
7	Q Have you done any personal study or	Q because its continued application,
8	observation in the Illinois River watershed so in	particularly to the 40 percent of the watershed area
9	our example we would know how far water would get	above 200 milligrams per kilogram Mehlich III P,
10	from Field 1 onto Field 2? 01:59PM	would result, would result in further P enrichment 02:02PM
11	A No. I have not.	of runoff and increase in P export. It doesn't say
12	Q Are you aware of anyone who has?	there's potential. It says it would result, doesn't
13	A No, I'm not.	it?
14	Q Let's turn to Page 274, Dr. Coale. In the	A Right, that's what it says, but they're using
15	left-hand column, the first full paragraph, the 01:59PM	that as an introduction to the area, variable source 02:02PM
16		·
17	second sentence there says, for instance, one might	area that says what they're suggesting is to pay
18	set P-management goals based solely on Mehlich III P	attention to where the runoff is being generated
	contents for soils over the entire watershed. Do	from within the watershed, those variable source
19	you see where I'm reading?	areas, and to avoid those variable source areas when
20	A Yes. 02:00PM	you are applying manure to the land. 02:03PM
21	Q And next sentence says, nearly 60 percent of	Q Well, is this sentence scientifically correct?
22	the soils over FD-36 are sufficiently high in P,	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. You are
23	over 100 kilograms per kilogram, so there would be	excerpting the document. It's misleading.
24	no further response to P applications. Let me stop	A I would say that that sentence in isolation
25	and ask you where the 100 milligrams per kilograms 02:00PM	could be correct in some soils and some locations 02:03PM
	142	144
1	comes from as an economic critical level in that	and maybe not in others.
2	watershed; do you know?	Q So the author's got it partly right and partly
3	A That's probably the Penn State University	wrong?
4	recommendation since this study was done in	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
5	Pennsylvania, but I can't say that for sure. 02:00PM	A My interpretation of what the authors are 02:03PM
6	Q All right. So at least in this little	doing with that sentence is using it to introduce
7	watershed, 60 percent of the soil is above that?	the following part of that paragraph, which talks
8	A Correct.	about the variable source areas, and their
9	Q Okay. A little farther down it says well,	recommendation that if you are in if you want
10	let's read the next sentence. This suggests not 02:01PM	to utilize well, in this case it's not litter; 02:04PM
11	applying P to those areas because its continued	it's dairy manure I believe, but if you want to use
12	application, particularly to 40 percent of the	manure on those sites, you're they are suggesting
13	watershed above 200 milligrams per kilogram Mehlich	you look at where the litter is being generated from
14	III P, would result in further P enrichment of	and avoid application of those sites.
15	runoff and increase in P export. So they're saying 02:01PM	Q Dr. Coale, all I'm interested in right now is 02:04PM
16	if you put more phosphorus on that area, you're	that further it says further continued
17	going to have more enrichment and more increase in	application would result, would, not might, but
17	going to have indice this minimum and indice increase in	
18	the P export?	would result in further P enrichment in runoff. Is
		would result in further P enrichment in runoff. Is that scientifically correct?
18	the P export?	
18 19	the P export?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	that scientifically correct?
18 19 20	the P export?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I think they were saying, excuse me, that the 02:01PM	that scientifically correct?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's 02:04PM
18 19 20 21	the P export?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I think they were saying, excuse me, that the potential might be there for increased increasing	that scientifically correct?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's 02:04PM been asked and answered.
18 19 20 21 22	the P export?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I think they were saying, excuse me, that the potential might be there for increased increasing the P further, and that's the only factor what was	that scientifically correct?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's 02:04PM been asked and answered.  MR. NANCE: I'm breaking it down in pieces
18 19 20 21 22 23	the P export?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I think they were saying, excuse me, that the potential might be there for increased increasing the P further, and that's the only factor what was changing that perhaps the export would be increased.	that scientifically correct?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's 02:04PM been asked and answered.  MR. NANCE: I'm breaking it down in pieces here.

1	twice now.	discussing. He told you if you you can read into
2	A Okay. What I'm saying is that on certain	the Record the balance of paragraph that starts with
3	sites, if you increase the soil test P level, you	the world alternatively. So would you do that?
4	can have resulting increase in runoff. In other	A Okay. Alternatively, incorporation of the VSA
5	sites, that might not happen. 02:05PM	hydrologic concepts discussed previously and the 02:07PM
6	Q Why might it not happen?	recognition of the similarity between patterns of P
7	A If there's no runoff generated on that site,	concentration in stream flow and P content in near
8	you would not have increased runoff from P.	stream soils suggest that P-management goals should
9	Q And if there were runoff generated from that	focus on the near stream areas rather than the whole
10	site? 02:05PM	watershed. 02:08PM
11	A Then you may or may not see more P moving. As	Q Okay. Then the next paragraph, controlling P
12	many factors, as we said before, that have to be	application in the near stream runoff producing
13	assessed on each site to determine how much	areas rather than areas further from channel appears
14	phosphorus may be transported off that site.	to have the greatest potential to decrease P export
15	Q Well, the question here is enrichment in 02:05PM	in stream flow; is that correct? 02:08PM
16	runoff, of runoff. So that assumes there's runoff,	A That's what it says here.
17	doesn't it?	Q Why would that have the greatest potential
18	A The authors' words are that there is	have a greater potential than cutting off all P
19	enrichment in runoff.	application?
20	Q And increase in P export? 02:06PM	A I don't interpret it saying that it would. 02:08PM
21	A That's what the authors wrote.	Q Well, if you stopped all P application, would
22	Q Okay. Are the authors right or wrong?	you have an even greater potential to decrease the P
23	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	export in stream flow?
24	A The authors without knowing what the	A I think what the authors are getting at here
25	specific site they are referring to, they could be 02:06PM	is that the if you're trying to strike a balance 02:09PM
	146	148
	side as a sald by some	
1	right or could be wrong.	between management of a farm and minimizing or
2 3	Q Okay. The next sentence says, however, recommending limited application of P to over half	reducing the risk of phosphorus loss in runoff, surface runoff, then one way to take a step towards
4	the watershed area could restrict farmers with	reducing that risk is to focus manure applications
5	confined animal operations. 02:06PM	on those portions of the landscape where you don't 02:09PM
6	A Correct.	expect runoff to be generated, and if you are going
7	Q Is that a true sentence?	to do that as a step to help reduce the potential
8	A That's a truly read sentence.	for phosphorus runoff with runoff water, then that's
9	Q Is it factually true?	a good practice to take.
10	A That if a farmer is utilizing manure and a 02:06PM	Q That's a good step? 02:09PM
11	limitation on the amount of acreage that manure may	A That's a good step to take, correct.
12	be applied to was put in place, then, yes, it would	Q If you wanted to absolutely minimize the
13	restrict this management.	runoff, would you do so by not putting any more
14	Q Okay. Dropping down to the next paragraph	phosphorus in the watershed?
15	MR. McDANIEL: Let me just interpose an 02:07PM	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 02:09PM
16	objection to the lack of completeness of the	A That would be a much more dramatic step to
17	examination for not reading the balance of that	take.
18	paragraph into the Record. Go ahead.	Q Okay. Next sentence, from the farmers'
19	Q Well, Dr. Coale, you can read the balance of	perspectives, this means less land area would be
20	the paragraph, the paragraph above. 02:07PM	impacted, therefore, allowing more land area 02:10PM
21	A I don't understand what you are asking me to	available for manure application. Did I read that
22	do.	correctly?
23	MR. McDANIEL: Okay. My objection was that	A Yes, you did.
24	he moved on in his examination without getting into	Q Okay, and so would it be fair to say that
25	the Record the balance of that paragraph you were 02:07PM	taking the small step lets farmers keep applying 02:10PM
	147	149

1	more phosphorus than taking the big step?	you're going to see Version 2, Version 3, Version 4,
2	A That's correct.	Version 5 come on as we understand how things work
3	Q Okay, and isn't part of the issue here really	better.
4	that we want to make it easier on farmers to keep	Q Okay.
5	using, in this case, cattle manure? 02:10PM	MR. McDANIEL: Bob, if you are at any point 02:13PM
6	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	ready to go in a little different direction, I could
7	A Part of the issue is to move a given farmer	stand a convenience break.
8	from to a production practice that has less risk,	MR. NANCE: Let's take a convenience break.
9	and it's a step-by-step incremental process of	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now off the Record.
10	education, and I interpret what these authors are 02:11PM	The time is 2:15 p.m. 02:13PM
11	saying is that if as a step in that education	(Following a short recess at 2:15 p.m.,
12	process backed up by their science, that says if	proceedings continued on the Record at 2:22 p.m.)
13	they have dairy manure to apply to the landscape and	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.
14	they needed that for the nitrogen supplying capacity	The time is 2:22 p.m.
15	for growing the silage or whatever they are growing, 02:11PM	Q Dr. Coale, I've handed you what I've marked as 02:21PM
16	that's a good step to help reduce the risk for	Exhibit No. 6. Do you recognize that as one of the
17	phosphorus loss because those portions of the	articles you cited in Paragraph 5H of your report?
18	landscape that are further distance from the stream	A Yes.
19	are much less likely to generate runoff water in the	Q Okay. This is another one where I'd sure like
20	first place. 02:11PM	you to pronounce the lead authors's last name for 02:21PM
21	Q Okay. What's the step after this?	me?
22	A In this scenario?	A Gburek.
23	Q Well, what's the step after your phosphorus	Q Gburek, okay, and Dr. Sharpley and others were
24	index?	on this report; right?
25	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 02:12PM	A Right. 02:22PM
	150	152
1	A In general?	O Okov Lat's see the extent to which you arrae
1 2	A In general?	Q Okay. Let's see the extent to which you agree
2	Q In general.	with certain of the statements in this article.
	<ul><li>Q In general.</li><li>A Globally? You do a phosphorus index</li></ul>	with certain of the statements in this article. Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the
2	<ul><li>Q In general.</li><li>A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that</li></ul>	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q In general.</li> <li>A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that 02:12PM</li> </ul>	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have  02:22PM
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q In general.</li><li>A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that</li></ul>	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and
2 3 4 5 6	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that say things you know, you have a low, medium,	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have  02:22PM
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that 02:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that 02:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that 02:12PM say things — you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that 02:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that 02:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that o2:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version 1 of a phosphorus index, there's Version 2 in the 02:13PM works. There's several updates on the way, on the way now, and those are being developed based on what	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the United States? 02:22PM  A I'm not familiar with the calculation of excess on a national basis, nor in the UK.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that 02:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version 1 of a phosphorus index, there's Version 2 in the 02:13PM works. There's several updates on the way, on the way now, and those are being developed based on what we've learned over the last several years of how to	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the United States? 02:22PM  A I'm not familiar with the calculation of excess on a national basis, nor in the UK.  Q I'd be surprised if you were. The next
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that 02:12PM say things — you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version 1 of a phosphorus index, there's Version 2 in the 02:13PM works. There's several updates on the way, on the way now, and those are being developed based on what we've learned over the last several years of how to improve them, and that was the goal from the very	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the United States? 02:22PM  A I'm not familiar with the calculation of excess on a national basis, nor in the UK.  Q I'd be surprised if you were. The next sentence, sir, actual surpluses are more dramatic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that 02:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version 1 of a phosphorus index, there's Version 2 in the 02:13PM works. There's several updates on the way, on the way now, and those are being developed based on what we've learned over the last several years of how to improve them, and that was the goal from the very beginning when the phosphorus indices were first 02:13PM	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the United States? 02:22PM  A I'm not familiar with the calculation of excess on a national basis, nor in the UK.  Q I'd be surprised if you were. The next sentence, sir, actual surpluses are more dramatic regionally because the areas where feed is produced 02:23PM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that o2:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version 1 of a phosphorus index, there's Version 2 in the 02:13PM works. There's several updates on the way, on the way now, and those are being developed based on what we've learned over the last several years of how to improve them, and that was the goal from the very beginning when the phosphorus indices were first 02:13PM being developed. I think almost universally the	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the United States? 02:22PM  A I'm not familiar with the calculation of excess on a national basis, nor in the UK.  Q I'd be surprised if you were. The next sentence, sir, actual surpluses are more dramatic regionally because the areas where feed is produced have become fragmented from those where livestock
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that o02:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version 1 of a phosphorus index, there's Version 2 in the 02:13PM works. There's several updates on the way, on the way now, and those are being developed based on what we've learned over the last several years of how to improve them, and that was the goal from the very beginning when the phosphorus indices were first 02:13PM being developed. I think almost universally the folks that were involved in developing them were	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the United States? 02:22PM  A I'm not familiar with the calculation of excess on a national basis, nor in the UK.  Q I'd be surprised if you were. The next sentence, sir, actual surpluses are more dramatic regionally because the areas where feed is produced have become fragmented from those where livestock are raised, with references. Is that a correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that o2:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version 1 of a phosphorus index, there's Version 2 in the 02:13PM works. There's several updates on the way, on the way now, and those are being developed based on what we've learned over the last several years of how to improve them, and that was the goal from the very beginning when the phosphorus indices were first 02:13PM being developed. I think almost universally the folks that were involved in developing them were saying this is the first cut and these things need	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the United States? 02:22PM  A I'm not familiar with the calculation of excess on a national basis, nor in the UK.  Q I'd be surprised if you were. The next sentence, sir, actual surpluses are more dramatic regionally because the areas where feed is produced have become fragmented from those where livestock are raised, with references. Is that a correct statement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased.  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version  1 of a phosphorus index, there's Version 2 in the outcome.  Works. There's several updates on the way, on the way now, and those are being developed based on what we've learned over the last several years of how to improve them, and that was the goal from the very beginning when the phosphorus indices were first outcome developed. I think almost universally the folks that were involved in developing them were saying this is the first cut and these things need to be improved and refined and updated over the	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the United States? 02:22PM  A I'm not familiar with the calculation of excess on a national basis, nor in the UK.  Q I'd be surprised if you were. The next sentence, sir, actual surpluses are more dramatic regionally because the areas where feed is produced have become fragmented from those where livestock are raised, with references. Is that a correct statement?  A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q In general.  A Globally? You do a phosphorus index assessment on the site. The outcome of that assessment gives you some management guidelines that o2:12PM say things you know, you have a low, medium, high, very high loss for P loss or whatever the outcome may be, and then you go back and look at how you might change management of that property or that field so that your risk is decreased. 02:12PM  Q Is there anything in the pipeline of your profession that's better than a phosphorus index yet to come?  A I would say if we're working now with Version 1 of a phosphorus index, there's Version 2 in the 02:13PM works. There's several updates on the way, on the way now, and those are being developed based on what we've learned over the last several years of how to improve them, and that was the goal from the very beginning when the phosphorus indices were first 02:13PM being developed. I think almost universally the folks that were involved in developing them were saying this is the first cut and these things need	with certain of the statements in this article.  Upper right-hand column there on the first page, the rapid growth and intensification of the livestock industry in certain areas of the USA and Europe have created imbalances between P input in feed and fertilizer and its output in produce with references. Is that a true statement as far as you're concerned?  A Yes. 02:22PM  Q Okay. The next sentence, on a national basis, an annual P surplus of 26 kilograms per hectare exists in the US, and I don't care about Europe, but does that sound a good figure for the excess in the United States? 02:22PM  A I'm not familiar with the calculation of excess on a national basis, nor in the UK.  Q I'd be surprised if you were. The next sentence, sir, actual surpluses are more dramatic regionally because the areas where feed is produced have become fragmented from those where livestock are raised, with references. Is that a correct statement?

Ī		
1	the extent the poultry feed fed in the Illinois	Q It's FD-36?
2	River watershed grows somewhere is grown	A Correct.
3	somewhere else?	Q What's the source of the Mehlich III P
4	A For the most part, I believe that's true.	categories that are there, over 200 excessive, 100,
5	Q Okay. That means the growth is fragmented 02:23PM	200, no crop response; do you know where those 02:26PM
6	from the consumption?	numbers come from?
7	A Correct.	A I would speculate. I'm not promising this is
8	Q Okay. Next sentence, aggravating the	a correct speculation. It would be from the Penn
9	situation even further, manure applications within	State University agronomy recommendations.
10	the livestock production areas are typically based 02:23PM	Q And do you know what those are based on, I 02:26PM
11	on crop N requirements. The desire is to minimize	mean, how they arrive at those numbers?
12	the purchase of commercial fertilizer and the risk	A Oh, I suspect they're well, I can't assume,
13	of NO3 leaching into groundwater. Is that a correct	but most land grant universities who generate
14	statement?	recommendations like this, they're based on field
15	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 02:23PM	studies over many years and many sites to determine 02:26PM
16	Q Is that a true statement?	where the responsive range to phosphorus is for
17	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	certain crops.
18	A Well, obviously in the year 2000 the authors	Q Okay. Let's go to Page 143, Dr. Coale. Let's
19	thought it was.	look at the last paragraph above the acknowledgement
20	Q Okay. Do you agree with that statement? 02:24PM	heading. 02:27PM
21	A I'm trying to rewind my brain nine years.	A Okay.
22	Nine years ago, it was probably an accurate	Q Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the
23	statement.	modified PI proposed is still only an interim
24	Q What's inaccurate about it today?	measure. Is that a true sentence?
25	A I think if you right now it's my tongue 02:24PM 154	A I don't know what they're referenced to. 02:27PM 156
-	total Politica Principal Control of the Control of	Lucia de la constanta de la co
1 2	is tied a little bit. The phrase typically based on	Interim measure to what?
3	crop nitrogen requirements is less common, less pervasive now than it was nine years ago.	Q That was going to be my next question.
4	Q Is that because there's more phosphorus based	A Then I'll answer it, I don't know what that
5	systems now than there were nine years ago? 02:24PM	means.  Q Okay. Next sentence, it provides immediate 02:27PM
6	A Yes.	direction for P management that accounts for the
7	Q Okay. Next sentence, the N-P ratio of manure,	spatially variable source and transport properties
8	two to one to six to one, is lower than the crop	of the watershed. I think we understand that.
9	uptake, seven to one to eleven to one, so N-based	A Okay.
10	manure management results in more P being added to 02:24PM	Q However, we must remember the figures 02:27PM
11	the soil than the soil requires. Without getting	presented in the introductory portion of the paper,
12	into whether we're more nitrogen or phosphorus based	colon, an annual excess of 26 kilograms of
13	now, at least in terms of 2000 when things were	phosphorus per hectare in the USA. We'll forget
14	nitrogen based, was that a true statement?	about Great Britain. A problem further complicated
15	A Yes. We've already mentioned that today. 02:25PM	by further uneven distribution typically tied to 02:28PM
16	Q Final sentence of that paragraph, in total	concentrated animal production, and did I read that
17	these factors contribute to an increased risk of P	correctly?
18	transport from agriculture land to surface waters.	A Yes, you did.
19	Is that a true statement today?	Q Okay. While we're developing tools to address
20	A Yes. 02:25PM	immediate P management in the at the watershed 02:28PM
21	Q Okay. Dr. Coale, let's turn over to Page 132,	scale, we should also be working to reduce these two
22	and is the little diagram or map on Page 132 part of	excesses. Achieving an overall P balance is the
23	the same watershed that we talked about a moment	ultimate answer to P management at the watershed
24	ago?	scale. Now, did I read that correctly?
25	A I believe it is. 02:25PM	A Yes, you did. 02:28PM
	155	157

1	Q What does that mean, sir?	Q How would you define it?
2	A What I interpret the author is meaning	A I wouldn't use it.
3	saying meaning by that last sentence is that at	MR. McDANIEL: Excuse me. It's your
4	the watershed scale an overall P balance would mean	question, Bob. He asked you a fair question.
5	that there is as much phosphorus brought into the 02:28PM	Q Is there a documented problem in the Illinois 02:31PM
6	watershed as there is that leaves the watershed.	River watershed with disturbingly high STPs brought
7	Q Do you agree that that's the ultimate answer	about by the land application of the defendants'
8	for watershed scale management?	poultry litter in some of the watershed?
9	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	MR. McDANIEL: Objection to form. It's
10	A Ultimate answer to what question? 02:29PM	argumentative. 02:32PM
11	Q I think they're talking about in the sentences	A I don't know what you mean by disturbingly
12	above that the excess of phosphorus and the uneven	high. It seemingly is artificially high. I don't
13	distribution of it. I mean, read it and satisfy	know what you are referring to.
14	yourself, but that's the way I read it.	Q Are you at all disturbed by the STPs that you
15	A That if you're in a given watershed, whatever 02:29PM	have seen in the data you've reviewed for areas 02:32PM
16	watershed it might be, that if you're bringing more	where people have either applied litter or are
17	phosphorus into the watershed than is being removed	asking to apply litter?
18	in the watershed, then you're going to be	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
19	accumulating phosphorus in that watershed.	A I've seen soil test data used by Dr. Johnson
20	Q Okay.	that I was disturbed by because just in my 02:32PM
21	A And I think that's what they're getting at.	professional opinion had to be absolutely wrong,
22	Q Aren't they getting at something more and,	some soil test values and some that were up in the
23	that is, that as much should go out as comes in?	tens of thousands, which I don't think can be right.
24	A That would be balance, right.	Q All right. Do you find anything that any soil
25	Q Okay. Do you agree that that's the 02:30PM	test values that you've seen from Dr. Johnson, which 02:32PM
	158	160
1	appropriate goal?	you don't think are just wrong, which disturb you?
2	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
3	A In my mind, that would be an appropriate goal	A Disturb me relative to what?
4	if there was a documented problem you're trying to	Q Either you're disturbed or you're not. It's
5	solve. 02:30PM	your own judgment. 02:33PM
6	Q Is there a documented problem in the Illinois	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
7	River watershed?	A I rarely get disturbed about data. I don't
8	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	know how to answer that question. I don't know what
9	Q Is there a documented problem in the Illinois	disturbed means.
10	River watershed with excess of phosphorus? 02:30PM	Q Do you know that the State of Arkansas has 02:33PM
11	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's	said that Benton and Washington Counties are
12	outside the scope of the opinions offered in his	nutrient surplus areas?
13	report.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
14	A If the question is whether in the Illinois	A I'm not aware of that.
15	River watershed there's a water quality issue in the 02:30PM	Q Are you aware that the State of Oklahoma 02:33PM
16	stream, in the open water, that's something I can't	considers the Illinois River watershed a nutrient
17	answer.	impaired area?
18	Q Okay. Is there a problem in the Illinois	A I have read that.
19	River watershed with there being a substantial	Q Is that just something that's morally neutral
20	amount of land with artificially high STPs? 02:31PM	to you? 02:34PM
21	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. Plus,	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
22	it's outside the scope of his	A I'm trying to address questions on a
23	A Okay. One make sure I understand what you	scientific point of view, and moral issues, I don't
24	are getting at. Artificially high is has what	know how to respond to that. I'm trying to be
	1	
25	meaning? Can you define that for me? 02:31PM	honest with you. 02:34PM

Q I appreciate your honesty. So as far as	and export in the watershed?
you're concerned, there's no phosphorus STP problem	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
in the Illinois River watershed?	A I'm not aware of that.
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	Q Do you believe any such proposal will be made
A I did not say that. 02:34PM	to the court? 02:37PM
Q Then what is the problem?	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	A Not that I know of. I have no knowledge of
A From what I know about the Illinois River	that.
watershed and in any other watershed probably	Q Are you aware of any proposal by the
anywhere on the face of the earth, there's going to 02:34PM	defendants that would actually reduce the STP levels 02:37PM
be sites where, from an optimum management of that	of high phosphorus lands in the watershed?
site, you would find there would be that the soil	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
P levels would be elevated to a point where it would	A I'm not aware of any proposed actions that
contribute to phosphorus loss from that site.	they would take in that regard.
There's other sites which that wouldn't be the case. 02:35PM	Q Are you aware of any proposal they will make 02:38PM
So a general statement about the Illinois River	to the court
watershed, I can't and hopefully won't answer	A No.
because I'm firmly convinced it has to be absolutely	Q to try to reduce the level of STP?
a site-specific assessment.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
Q But in the Illinois River watershed, there are 02:35PM	Q Let's look at Section 6 of your report on Page 02:38PM
sites with STPs high enough that they seriously	9, Dr. Coale. In Section 6 there, and I'll call it
contribute to transport of phosphorus off the site?	the introductory part because it doesn't have a
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	letter, you discuss something that was in Dr.
A I would suspect that there are sites that when	Engel's report?
evaluated properly, using a tool like a phosphorus 02:35PM	A Correct. 02:39PM
162	164
site index or a similar type tool, I would	Q Okay. Just a moment. I don't suppose you
professionally expect to find sites that would be	happen to have Dr. Engel's report on you?
have elevated concern along with sites that did not	A No, sir.
have elevated concern.	Q I have a copy, and I don't intend to make it
Q Have you looked at the results of any 02:35PM	an exhibit, but let me flip open to Page 37 and see 02:39PM
phosphorus index analyses of any sites in the	un eximple, but let like imp open to rage 57 une see
	if that's the part of Dr. Engel's report that you
	if that's the part of Dr. Engel's report that you were talking about.
Illinois River watershed?	were talking about.
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed.	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed.  I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it 02:40PM
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM  Q You're talking about like a study or an actual	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it again. Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM  Q You're talking about like a study or an actual test result?	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it again. Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit  No. 7 Coale and see if that is the Dr. Sharpley
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM  Q You're talking about like a study or an actual test result?  A Oh. It was a study, research study where they	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it again. Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit  No. 7 Coale and see if that is the Dr. Sharpley article that you were talking about, you and Dr.
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM  Q You're talking about like a study or an actual test result?  A Oh. It was a study, research study where they utilized the phosphorus index to generate the	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it again. Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit  No. 7 Coale and see if that is the Dr. Sharpley article that you were talking about, you and Dr.  Engel are both talking about here I think.
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM  Q You're talking about like a study or an actual test result?  A Oh. It was a study, research study where they utilized the phosphorus index to generate the dataset. 02:36PM	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it again. Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit  No. 7 Coale and see if that is the Dr. Sharpley article that you were talking about, you and Dr.  Engel are both talking about here I think.  A It appears to be, yes. 02:41PM
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM  Q You're talking about like a study or an actual test result?  A Oh. It was a study, research study where they utilized the phosphorus index to generate the dataset. 02:36PM  Q Okay. Have you looked at any actual	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it again. Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit  No. 7 Coale and see if that is the Dr. Sharpley article that you were talking about, you and Dr.  Engel are both talking about here I think.  A It appears to be, yes. 02:41PM  Q Let's turn what was your concern about Dr.
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM  Q You're talking about like a study or an actual test result?  A Oh. It was a study, research study where they utilized the phosphorus index to generate the dataset. 02:36PM  Q Okay. Have you looked at any actual phosphorus index test results?	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it again. Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit  No. 7 Coale and see if that is the Dr. Sharpley article that you were talking about, you and Dr.  Engel are both talking about here I think.  A It appears to be, yes. 02:41PM  Q Let's turn what was your concern about Dr.  Engel's report, and if you want to look at it to
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM  Q You're talking about like a study or an actual test result?  A Oh. It was a study, research study where they utilized the phosphorus index to generate the dataset. 02:36PM  Q Okay. Have you looked at any actual phosphorus index test results?  A No, I have not.	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it again. Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit  No. 7 Coale and see if that is the Dr. Sharpley article that you were talking about, you and Dr.  Engel are both talking about here I think.  A It appears to be, yes. 02:41PM  Q Let's turn what was your concern about Dr.  Engel's report, and if you want to look at it to answer that, you may.
Illinois River watershed?  A I've looked at some results of some phosphorus index studies that were done by the University of Arkansas, but I'm not I can't say now whether 02:36PM they were in the watershed or outside the watershed. I don't know where they exactly were.  Q Were those phosphorus index reports in your considered materials?  A Yes. 02:36PM  Q You're talking about like a study or an actual test result?  A Oh. It was a study, research study where they utilized the phosphorus index to generate the dataset. 02:36PM  Q Okay. Have you looked at any actual phosphorus index test results?	were talking about.  A The part that's highlighted?  Q What was your question again, Doctor?  A The part that you have highlighted here? 02:40PM  Q Well, Section 8.1.  A I believe it is.  Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what  A You want this one back?  Q Keep it handy. We may want to talk about it 02:40PM  again. Let me show you what I've marked as Exhibit  No. 7 Coale and see if that is the Dr. Sharpley  article that you were talking about, you and Dr.  Engel are both talking about here I think.  A It appears to be, yes. 02:41PM  Q Let's turn what was your concern about Dr.  Engel's report, and if you want to look at it to answer that, you may.

		1
1	across-the-board, uniform, generic estimate that 5	Q Okay. Phosphorus uptake and harvest removal
2	percent of the poultry litter P that applied to	by crops ranges from 10 to 40 percent of applied P
3	pastures was transported to natural surface water	due to low crop demand compared to N and the rapid
4	vehicles, runoff pathways, and the point I'm trying	and only slowly reversible sorption of P to
5	to make is that to have a uniform application of a 02:42PM	aluminum, iron and calcium compounds in soil, and it 02:45PM
6	any value, more or less 5 percent happens to be the	cites to Figure 3 again; right?
7	one he picks from Sharpley, probably is not an	A Correct.
8	accurate representation because back to our	Q Would you agree with that statement?
9	site-specific nature of how runoff is going to be	A It appears to be accurate.
10	generated and how P is going to be transported, I 02:42PM	Q Okay. The next statement, phosphorus loss in 02:45PM
11	think applying a constant uniform 5 percent loss	surface runoff is generally greater than in
12	factor is just a gross overgeneralization. That's	subsurface flow and depends on the rate, time, and
13	the point I was trying to make.	to the next page, method of P application. The form
14	Q Okay. Let's look at Page 378 of Exhibit 7.	of fertilizer or manure applied in the amount
15	A Okay. 02:43PM	A Hang on. I lost you there. 02:45PM
16	Q And there's a couple little diagrams there.	Q It's between the two pictures.
17	Let's look at the lower of the two, which is called	A Sorry.
18	Figure 3.	Q Yeah, they hid it there. Depends on the rate,
19	A Okay.	time and method of P application, the form of
20	Q Have you seen that before? 02:43PM	fertilizer or manure applied and the amount and time 02:46PM
21	A Yes, I have.	of rainfall after application, and then it's got
22	Q That shows, of course, P runoff 5 percent.	references.
23	A Correct.	A Uh-huh.
24	Q Okay. So does Dr. Engel say more than that	Q Do you agree with that statement?
25	about the P runoff? 02:43PM	A I agree that, yeah, they're mentioning all the 02:46PM
	166	168
1	A I believe he just accepted that number at face	different factors that need to be considered when
2	value and applied it across the whole area.	looking at phosphorus loss in runoff.
3	Q Okay. Let's look back at 377. We'll back up	Q Okay. Next sentence, overall excuse me.
4	just a little bit. Let's walk through this together	Leaching of P can occur in sandy, organic or peaty
5	and see if you agree with the statements in this 02:44PM	soils, those with low P adsorption capacities, and 02:46PM
6	report. There in the lower right-hand corner	those with substantial preferential flow pathways.
7	there's a bolded heading fate of land applied	Do you agree with that?
8	phosphorus in poultry operations; do you see that?	A It can, yes.
9	A Yes, I do.	Q Okay. Next sentence, overall and this
10	Q The fate of P in typical poultry operations in 02:44PM	takes us over to Page 389 P loss is agronomically 02:46PM
11	the United States is shown in Figure 3, and that's	small, generally less than 2 kilograms of phosphorus
12 13	the figure we just looked at; right?	per hectare, and double bracket, less than 1.75
14	A Yes.  O Okay Typically loss than one third of food P	pounds per acre, representing a minor proportion of
15	Q Okay. Typically less than one-third of feed P is utilized by poultry, with the remainder excreted 02:44PM	P applied as fertilizer or manure, generally less than 5 percent. Do you agree with that proposition? 02:47PM
16		
17	in manure and applied to land for crop use, and it cites a reference.	A Again, I'd have to rely on the authors for the 5 percent number. I wasn't I didn't follow the
18	A Uh-huh.	calculations through there.
19	Q Do you agree with that statement?	Q Is your complaint with Dr. Engel that he said
20	A I'd have to rely on that reference. I don't 02:44PM	5 percent and Dr. Sharpley, at least in the text, 02:47PM
21	really know that percentage.	says less than 5 percent?
22	Q Okay. Would you generally rely on Dr.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
23	Sharpley and Sheri Herron and Dr. Daniel to know	A No, sir. I made that comment about Dr.
24	their stuff on a point like that?	Engel's because I think what Dr. Sharpley in this
25	A Yes, I would. 02:45PM	paper with his co-authors is trying to point out is 02:47PM
	167	169

1	kind of a general relative scale of things for them	Q Let's look at it for just a minute and see if
2	to form. I mean, this is not a highly technical	we can agree on what it says. It talks in terms of
3	article. It's more of a pseudo technical article,	being a phosphorus budget for poultry litter
4	if you will, and I think it's meant to put things in	application. Do you see that just in the title
5	relative perspective, and that's where the 5 percent 02:47PM	above? 02:50PM
6	came from. My concern I had was that if someone	A Uh-huh.
7	someone like Dr. Engel, who knowingly or unknowingly	Q Okay. Phosphorus uptake by Bermuda grass and
8	applied a generality to a wide range of specific	total phosphorus load in surface and subsurface flow
9	conditions, it may be an appropriate number for some	from a Ruston fine sandy loam in Oklahoma. Okay?
10	sites and it might not be an appropriate number for 02:48PM	A Okay. 02:50PM
11	other sites.	-
12	My point comes back to, I don't think you can	Q Along the left-hand side vertically, we've got
	· ·	some years set out; is that right?
13	apply a percent loss factor to all the landscape in	A Okay.
14	the IRW uniformly. It has to be done much more	Q It says before application, '89 and '90;
15	specifically on a site-by-site basis. 02:48PM	right? 02:50PM
16	Q So Dr. Sharpley and his colleagues should not	A Correct.
17	have used the word overall in that last sentence?	Q During application, '91, '92 and '93?
18	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	A Uh-huh.
19	A No, sir. I think I already mentioned what I	Q And after application '94 through '99; right?
20	thought their intent was, is to be a general 02:48PM	A Right. 02:51PM
21	guidance document, a general perspective of relative	Q The second column appears to me to be litter
22	scales for someone who had much less knowledge than	added in terms of kilograms per hectare per year?
23	the authors did.	A Litter phosphorus added.
24	Q That's not what they say.	Q You are correct, sir.
25	A Well, sorry. 02:48PM	A Yes.
	170	172
1	Q I mean, they don't say they're writing for the	Q The next two columns talk about Bermuda grass;
2	uninformed, do they?	right.
3	A No, but this is the Journal of Soil & Water	A Correct.
4	Conservation, which is a more publicly read journal	Q There's the yield of the Bermuda grass and the
5	than others. 02:49PM	phosphorus uptake of the Bermuda grass? 02:51PM
6	Q Is there some truth that the public doesn't	A Correct.
7	get that it ought to?	Q Okay. Then there is total P loss and flow is
8	A No. I'm just saying it's probably written at	kind of the next two columns; right?
9	a level for a more general consumption than, for	A Yes.
10	example, a readership of the Journal of 02:49PM	Q Surface and subsurface? 02:51PM
11	Environmental Quality that has a different	A Uh-huh.
12	readership.	Q And then on the right-hand column, right-hand
13	Q Are you saying Dr. Sharpley was inaccurate	side there's P balance; is that right?
14	when he said overall or generally less than 5	A That's what it says, yes.
15	percent? 02:49PM	Q Okay. Now, in this chart do the years '89 and 02:51PM
16	A Not at all.	'90 reflect kind of the baseline before the
17	Q Okay. Let's turn over to Page 380. There's	experiment started?
18	Table 2 at the top of the page. Do you see that?	A I would presume it does.
19	A Yes.	Q Okay, and then for three years, am I reading
20	Q And is that, in fact, reporting the results of 02:49PM	this correctly, they applied 180 kilograms per 02:51PM
21	a study done in Oklahoma?	hectare per year of litter phosphorus?
22	A According to the title, yes.	A 140.
23		
	Q Are you familiar with this table?	Q Excuse me. 140. You are correct again.
24	Q Are you familiar with this table? A It's been a long, long time since I've looked	Q Excuse me. 140. You are correct again. A Okay.
24 25		
	A It's been a long, long time since I've looked	A Okay.

1	A Correct.	still nine-tenths of a kilogram per hectare per
2	Q Okay. The next column shows the Bermuda grass	year; right?
3	yield and shows how it went up after the phosphorus	A Correct.
4	was applied; right?	Q It's that would be over four times the
5	A Uh-huh. 02:52PM	baseline? 02:54PM
6	Q And then began to decline after they stopped	A Correct.
7	applying it. The next	Q Now, is that surface flow and the period of
8	A Which is probably a large result to the	application, that comes in large part, does it not,
9	nitrogen being applied, not necessarily the	from the soluble phosphorus in the litter itself?
10	phosphorus being applied. 02:52PM	A Presumably. 02:54PM
11	Q Okay. The phosphorus uptake is in the next	Q Okay, and then after the application stopped,
12	column. Does that represent the phosphorus taken up	it would be because the STP had been elevated, or
13	by all of that Bermuda grass?	would it not?
14	A I presume it does, yes.	A Well, there still may be some direct result
15	Q And, again, at the baseline it's 5.9 and 6.4 02:52PM	from litter that's still on the soil surface. 02:55PM
16	kilograms per hectare per year; right?	Q So it would be a combination of that and the
17	A Correct.	increased STP?
18	Q And it jumps when they apply the litter.	A As it would be during the application years as
19	A Uh-huh.	well.
20	Q Let's look at the total P in the flow. The 02:53PM	Q Okay, and would the same thing be said for the 02:55PM
21	baseline is two-tenths kilogram per hectare per	subsurface numbers in the next column?
22	year; is that right?	A Generally, yes, but much less dramatically.
23	A That's correct.	Q Okay. All right. Let's go back to your
24	Q Did I read that correctly, and for the surface	report, if we can for a moment. You've explained
25	flow? 02:53PM	your concern about what Dr. Engel said, but if 02:56PM
	174	176
1	A Surface flow.	and his reliance on Dr. Sharpley's article that we
2	Q Yes, sir. Now, what happens during the	just looked at.
3	application of the litter to the three years to the	*
		A Correct.
4	surface flow?	
		A Correct.  Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not?  02:56PM
4	surface flow?	Q He cited other articles here in his report,
4 5	surface flow? A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM
4 5 6	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This
4 5 6 7	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up.
4 5 6 7 8	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline,	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you
4 5 6 7 8 9	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any
4 5 6 7 8 9	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's – I don't have the math, but it	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's – I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?  A Okay. 02:54PM  Q And in 1993 there it would be we're both going to get tasked here.	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report? A Looks very similar, if it's not identical. 02:57PM Hang on a second. It looks identical. Q Okay. In fact, he referenced Dr. Sharpley's
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?  A Okay. 02:54PM  Q And in 1993 there it would be we're both going to get tasked here.  A Right, something greater.	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report? A Looks very similar, if it's not identical. 02:57PM Hang on a second. It looks identical. Q Okay. In fact, he referenced Dr. Sharpley's report, didn't he?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?  A Okay. 02:54PM  Q And in 1993 there it would be we're both going to get tasked here.  A Right, something greater.  Q Something greater, 39 times the baseline	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM  A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report? A Looks very similar, if it's not identical. 02:57PM Hang on a second. It looks identical. Q Okay. In fact, he referenced Dr. Sharpley's report, didn't he? A Yes, he did.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?  A Okay. 02:54PM  Q And in 1993 there it would be we're both going to get tasked here.  A Right, something greater.  Q Something greater, 39 times the baseline perhaps? 02:54PM	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM  A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM  A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report? A Looks very similar, if it's not identical. 02:57PM Hang on a second. It looks identical. Q Okay. In fact, he referenced Dr. Sharpley's report, didn't he? A Yes, he did. Q Okay. Do you have any criticism of that? 02:57PM
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's — I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?  A Okay. 02:54PM  Q And in 1993 there it would be — we're both going to get tasked here.  A Right, something greater.  Q Something greater, 39 times the baseline perhaps? 02:54PM  A Uh-huh.	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM  A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM  A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report? A Looks very similar, if it's not identical. 02:57PM Hang on a second. It looks identical. Q Okay. In fact, he referenced Dr. Sharpley's report, didn't he? A Yes, he did. Q Okay. Do you have any criticism of that? 02:57PM A No.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's — I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?  A Okay. 02:54PM  Q And in 1993 there it would be — we're both going to get tasked here.  A Right, something greater.  Q Something greater, 39 times the baseline perhaps? 02:54PM  A Uh-huh.  Q And then it begins to drop down in the	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report? A Looks very similar, if it's not identical. 02:57PM Hang on a second. It looks identical. Q Okay. In fact, he referenced Dr. Sharpley's report, didn't he? A Yes, he did. Q Okay. Do you have any criticism of that? 02:57PM A No. Q We're done with that for the time being.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's — I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?  A Okay. 02:54PM  Q And in 1993 there it would be — we're both going to get tasked here.  A Right, something greater.  Q Something greater, 39 times the baseline perhaps? 02:54PM  A Uh-huh.  Q And then it begins to drop down in the following years, right, after they stop declining?	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report? A Looks very similar, if it's not identical. 02:57PM Hang on a second. It looks identical. Q Okay. In fact, he referenced Dr. Sharpley's report, didn't he? A Yes, he did. Q Okay. Do you have any criticism of that? 02:57PM A No. Q We're done with that for the time being. Based on the fact that you didn't have any problem
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's — I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?  A Okay. 02:54PM  Q And in 1993 there it would be — we're both going to get tasked here.  A Right, something greater.  Q Something greater, 39 times the baseline perhaps? 02:54PM  A Uh-huh.  Q And then it begins to drop down in the following years, right, after they stop declining?  A Right. '94 is less than '93.	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM  A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM  A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report? A Looks very similar, if it's not identical. 02:57PM Hang on a second. It looks identical. Q Okay. In fact, he referenced Dr. Sharpley's report, didn't he? A Yes, he did. Q Okay. Do you have any criticism of that? 02:57PM A No. Q We're done with that for the time being. Based on the fact that you didn't have any problem with Dr. Engel's reliance on the other reports,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	surface flow?  A The '91, '92, '93 years, when there's 02:53PM application occurring, the P loss in surface flow was elevated above the baseline.  Q Was elevated considerably above the baseline, wasn't it? In 1991 it would be 19 times the baseline; right? 02:53PM  A Well, it's — I don't have the math, but it might be 19 times if I do the math on that.  Q Okay. 1992, it would be about 25 times the baseline?  A Okay. 02:54PM  Q And in 1993 there it would be — we're both going to get tasked here.  A Right, something greater.  Q Something greater, 39 times the baseline perhaps? 02:54PM  A Uh-huh.  Q And then it begins to drop down in the following years, right, after they stop declining?	Q He cited other articles here in his report, did he not? 02:56PM A I don't recall which articles he cited. This is the only one I remember picking up. Q Okay. Would you look at those and see if you have any because in your report you haven't made any criticism of his reliance on these other articles. 02:56PM A Then I must not have had issue with them. Q Okay. Flip the page just one page over in Dr. Engel's report. Is that the same diagram that Dr. Sharpley used in his report? A Looks very similar, if it's not identical. 02:57PM Hang on a second. It looks identical. Q Okay. In fact, he referenced Dr. Sharpley's report, didn't he? A Yes, he did. Q Okay. Do you have any criticism of that? 02:57PM A No. Q We're done with that for the time being. Based on the fact that you didn't have any problem

1	to testify critically against him for having used	A Yes, it is.
2	those; you're not going to testify there's anything	Q Let's turn over to Page 386 of that in the
3	wrong with what he did with those other reports?	summary and conclusions section.
4	A No. Like I said before, my only concern was	A Okay.
5	using the 5 percent number from Sharpley, which 02:58PM	Q Let's talk for a minute on the second 03:01PM
6	using that uniformly and ubiquitously across all the	paragraph down under that. Sustainable P management
7	watershed area, and I did go on and talk in my	begins with sound feed decisions, which in the
8	report about how, you know, I had a conversation	poultry industry lies with the integrator rather
9	with Dr. Sharpley about where that 5 percent came	than the individual farmer. Why is that the case?
10	from because I didn't quite understand where it came 02:58PM	A Well, my understanding of the integrated 03:01PM
11	from either, and he explained to me that it's	production of poultry is that the poultry companies
12	outlined in my report where it came from and how	blend and manufacture and provide the feed, and it's
13	it's probably a worst case scenario, but it's used	not the responsibility or the job of the farmer to
14	to kind of put things in relative perspective, one	supply or blend to supply the feed.
15	to another. 02:58PM	Q Okay. Next sentence, phosphorus inputs onto a 03:02PM
16	Q When did you talk to Dr. Sharpley about that?	farm should be matched as closely as possible with P
17	A This past summer. I don't remember the exact	export as poultry or crop products. Do you agree
18	date. Summer of '08 sometime.	with that?
19	Q Did he tell you that his 5 percent figure was	A Yes. That's the same issue we talked about
20	wrong? 02:59PM	before, that if you perceive there's a problem with 03:02PM
21	A No, but we discussed as outlined in my	phosphorus lost from that farm, then you should do
22	report, we discussed where it came from, and a lot	as close a job you can do to balance imports with
23	of it was from rainfall simulation studies and small	exports.
24	plot studies with high intensity rainfall events and	Q Okay, and we were talking about earlier on a
25	edge of plot sample collection, and he said on 02:59PM	watershed scale, but I read this am I correct in 03:02PM
	178	180
	and the mark able. We mark able to the block	was New Address of Community of the
1 2	average it's probably it's probably at the high	reading this as a farm scale?  A This is written on a farm scale basis I
3	end of the range, and it probably was a I think the worst case scenario situation, but he didn't	believe.
4	say it was wrong.	Q How would a poultry grower do that; how would
5	Q Those rainfall simulation tests that or 02:59PM	he balance the inputs of phosphorus to his farm with 03:02PM
6	studies that Dr. Sharpley talked about, those are	the outputs of phosphorus?
7	the kind of studies that have been used commonly to	A Well, it would be very difficult because he
8	develop phosphorus indices and for other purposes in	doesn't control the inputs. He doesn't control the
9	your field; right?	feed that comes in. The farm would have very little
10	A That's correct. 03:00PM	control. 03:03PM
11	Q And he's not saying that those are unreliable	Q Okay. Skip down two sentences, long-term
12	or he shouldn't have used them or anything like	solutions are likely to include development of
13	that?	alternative uses for manure and litter. Is that
14	A No. They're designed and conducted using the	something you agree with?
15	standard protocol, and professionally we agreed on 03:00PM	A In long-term in the case that if it's a 03:03PM
16	what the standard protocol would be, and that	documented problem on a specific location where you
17	protocol is designed to accentuate the extremes of	have phosphorus loss concerns and you can't get that
18	possible variation and differences. In other words,	individual property into balance, then they may have
19	it's a very intense assessment, but he didn't do	to look at alternative uses for the litter, yes.
20	that. He followed the protocol. 03:00PM	Q Would that principle hold on the scale of the 03:03PM
21	Q The article we've been talking about or the	watershed as well?
22	last article of Dr. Sharpley's, Exhibit No. 7,	A I don't think you can extend it to a
23	that's entitled Overcoming the Challenges of	watershed. I think you, again, would have to assess
24	Phosphorus-Based Management in Poultry Farming; is	site by site within the watershed.
25	that right? 03:01PM	Q Okay. How does a farmer find alternative uses 03:04PM
	179	181

	criteria of that plan are more stringent than the
A The most common way to find alternative uses	plan of a general farm where litter is being
would be to have the litter removed off the farm and	applied. So, for example, the receiving farm
used as a fertilizer on an adjacent farm or a farm	this is the Maryland scenario. The receiving farm
down the road that can use it. 03:04PM	for transport of litter is under tighter scrutiny 03:07PM
Q And would that be a circumstance where, as we	than the farm where it was generated.
talked about before, you look for the most efficient	Q Okay, but is the scrutiny so tight that it's
and effective use for it?	only applied where both nitrogen and phosphorus are
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	needed?
A If he can't efficiently and effectively, he 03:04PM	A No, it's not. 03:07PM
being the male gendered farmer, cannot use the	Q Is the in Maryland is the Maryland
litter efficiently and effectively on his farm, then	phosphorus site index used for the receiving farm?
the most effective use might be on a farm down the	A Yes, it is.
road that does not have litter. Maybe it's just a	Q What do you know about receiving farms in the
beef ranching operation and they can use it 03:05PM	Oklahoma or in the Illinois River watershed; what 03:071
effectively there.	are the requirements for someone to receive litter?
Q Is the farmer who owns the poultry houses	A The details I don't know intimately. My
A Uh-huh.	understanding is they had to be under the nutrient
Q in the real world, do they go through any	management guidance, which include the 590 guidance
thought process that if they have to leave the farm, 03:05PM	or the PI guidance in Arkansas, where receiving. 03:08PM
to look for the most efficient or effective place to	Q Do either one of those regimes, either the
put it?	Oklahoma 590 or the index in Arkansas, require that
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	litter be put down only where there's a need for
A I can't speak to their thought process the	both nitrogen and phosphorus?
farmer would use, but that is the guidance 03:05PM	A Not that I'm aware of. 03:08PM
182	184
Q Okay, and when I say that, I'm talking, as we talk before, Doctor, about the place that needs both nitrogen and phosphorus. 03:05PM	Even though there's been a concerted effort to implement remedial measures through voluntary and regulatory means, the long-term challenges of 03:08PM
A Okay.	accumulating manure and litter on poultry farms has
Q In the real world, does a farmer do that that	
	been and remains difficult to overcome. Do you
you know of?	agree with that statement?
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	agree with that statement? A Yes.
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more 03:09PP
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more 03:09PF research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as 03:09PM
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM agree with you. The farmer probably doesn't think	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as it is transported through a watershed will help
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM agree with you. The farmer probably doesn't think of it past whatever deal, whatever transaction deal	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as it is transported through a watershed will help develop realistic expectations for BMPs. Did I read
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM agree with you. The farmer probably doesn't think of it past whatever deal, whatever transaction deal he has with a broker.	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as it is transported through a watershed will help develop realistic expectations for BMPs. Did I read that correctly?
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM agree with you. The farmer probably doesn't think of it past whatever deal, whatever transaction deal he has with a broker.  Q Okay. Does any of your extension education	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as it is transported through a watershed will help develop realistic expectations for BMPs. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM agree with you. The farmer probably doesn't think of it past whatever deal, whatever transaction deal he has with a broker.  Q Okay. Does any of your extension education that you do in Maryland tell third-party brokers 03:06PM	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as it is transported through a watershed will help develop realistic expectations for BMPs. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's a sink and a source of P? 03:09PM
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM agree with you. The farmer probably doesn't think of it past whatever deal, whatever transaction deal he has with a broker.  Q Okay. Does any of your extension education that you do in Maryland tell third-party brokers 03:06PM that they should find places where both phosphorus	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as it is transported through a watershed will help develop realistic expectations for BMPs. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's a sink and a source of P? 03:09PM  A Sink is a physical location where phosphorus
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM agree with you. The farmer probably doesn't think of it past whatever deal, whatever transaction deal he has with a broker.  Q Okay. Does any of your extension education that you do in Maryland tell third-party brokers 03:06PM that they should find places where both phosphorus and nitrogen are needed?	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as it is transported through a watershed will help develop realistic expectations for BMPs. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's a sink and a source of P? 03:09PM  A A sink is a physical location where phosphorus is, such as taken out of the flow way, taken out of
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM agree with you. The farmer probably doesn't think of it past whatever deal, whatever transaction deal he has with a broker.  Q Okay. Does any of your extension education that you do in Maryland tell third-party brokers 03:06PM that they should find places where both phosphorus and nitrogen are needed?  A The sites where the receiving farmers where	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as 03:09PM it is transported through a watershed will help develop realistic expectations for BMPs. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's a sink and a source of P? 03:09PM  A A sink is a physical location where phosphorus is, such as taken out of the flow way, taken out of the system, adsorbed to soil adsorbed to iron and
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A Farmers, who are looking for alternative 03:05PM sources to utilize the litter that they cannot utilize effectively, typically turn it over to a third-party broker in my experience, and then that broker goes through his avenues of distributing that to his clients. I don't know. At that point I 03:06PM agree with you. The farmer probably doesn't think of it past whatever deal, whatever transaction deal he has with a broker.  Q Okay. Does any of your extension education that you do in Maryland tell third-party brokers 03:06PM that they should find places where both phosphorus and nitrogen are needed?	agree with that statement?  A Yes.  Q Drop down two more sentences. However, more research is not the single or final solution. You better read the whole thing so you got that in context. You can read it but I'll read it so the Record has it. The next sentence says, research that better quantifies the sinks and sources of P as it is transported through a watershed will help develop realistic expectations for BMPs. Did I read that correctly?  A Yes, you did.  Q What's a sink and a source of P? 03:09PM  A A sink is a physical location where phosphorus is, such as taken out of the flow way, taken out of

1	Q Okay, and tell me what a BMP is.	the overall sustainability of poultry operations,
2	A Best management practice.	finding alternative uses for manure and litter,
3	Q And are those the sort of practices that in	moving manure and litter to areas of feed and forage
4	your extension work you try to get farmers to employ	production and adoption and maintenance of
5	for various reasons on their farms? 03:10PM	innovative BMPs at farm and watershed scales. 03:12PM
6	A Correct.	A Uh-huh.
7	Q Okay. Including environmental reasons on	Q Let's break that down and talk about that in
8	their farms?	little pieces, if we can. We've talked about the
9	A Yes.	challenges. When you talk about overall
10	Q Okay. Next sentence, however, more research 03:10PM	sustainability, what does that mean in the context 03:12PM
11	is not the single or final solution. Many farmers	of poultry operations?
12	simply do not have the financial resources to	A Sustainability is a really loaded word. It
13	implement and maintain costly remedial measures. Is	implies depends on the conversation and who is
14	that a true sentence; those two sentences together	involved. It implies economic sustainability,
15	are true? 03:10PM	profitability, and what's sustainable for one 03:13PM
16	A I think it's very accurate. I think farmers	individual is not sustainable in the mind of a
17	who are trying to manage their operation are always	different farm who is expecting a higher rate of
18	trying to balance being as efficient and effective	return, a higher profit. Sustainability as far as
19	as they possibly can, utilizing nutrients, the	nutrient balance on a farm, sustainability regarding
20	utmost efficiency from an agronomic view, being as 03:11PM	the relationship of a farm operation and the 03:13PM
21	protective of the environmental resources as they	surrounding ecosystem. So really that word is
22	possibly can, and at the same time they don't have	really a loaded term. Depends on what type of
23	in those wallets and they can't afford to spend a	conversation you're having, but all those elements
24	lot of money if it's decreasing their bottom line	are part of being sustainable.
25	and it's costing them a lot of money. So they are 03:11PM	Q Okay. So it's in the context of poultry 03:13PM
	186	188
1	constantly balancing. They're making trade-offs	operations, it's at least both financial and
2	between what best management practice can I	environmental; those are two of the factors of
3	implement and what it's going to cost me to	sustainability?
4	implement that. That's part of their business	A Those are two of probably several factors,
5	decision every day. 03:11PM	right. 03:14PM
6	Q Let's turn over to the top of 386. Despite	Q Okay. Finding alternative uses for manure and
7	there being a variety of programs to help defray	litter, I guess we talked about that before. The
8	remedial costs, institutional red tape and	farmers try to if they can't use it on site, they
9	conflicting requirements often limit program	try to move it off site
10	enrollment and hinder widespread adoption. Is that 03:11PM	A Correct. 03:14PM
11	a true statement?	Q and give it to a broker or whatever?
12	A The only programs I'm really somewhat familiar	Moving manure and litter to areas of feed and forage
13	with are the programs in Maryland. I'm not familiar	production, what does that mean?
	1	
14	with what they may be specifically referring to, and	A I interpret that to mean exactly the point you
	with what they may be specifically referring to, and there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM	A I interpret that to mean exactly the point you brought up earlier today, where if you're growing 03:14PM
14		, , ,
14 15	there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM	brought up earlier today, where if you're growing 03:14PM
14 15 16	there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM simply because it's difficult to fill out the forms	brought up earlier today, where if you're growing 03:14PM grain to use your example, I think you said Iowa
14 15 16 17	there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM simply because it's difficult to fill out the forms and keep track of all the paperwork and there's red	brought up earlier today, where if you're growing grain to use your example, I think you said Iowa before. If you're growing grain in Iowa, should the
14 15 16 17	there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM simply because it's difficult to fill out the forms and keep track of all the paperwork and there's red tape and it's troublesome, so they say forget about	brought up earlier today, where if you're growing grain to use your example, I think you said Iowa before. If you're growing grain in Iowa, should the litter they are proposing that if you're let
14 15 16 17 18	there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM simply because it's difficult to fill out the forms and keep track of all the paperwork and there's red tape and it's troublesome, so they say forget about it.	brought up earlier today, where if you're growing grain — to use your example, I think you said Iowa before. If you're growing grain in Iowa, should the litter — they are proposing that if you're — let me make sure I'm reading right — moving manure and
14 15 16 17 18 19	there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM simply because it's difficult to fill out the forms and keep track of all the paperwork and there's red tape and it's troublesome, so they say forget about it.  Q Is there enough money in Maryland to help 03:12PM	brought up earlier today, where if you're growing grain — to use your example, I think you said Iowa before. If you're growing grain in Iowa, should the litter — they are proposing that if you're — let me make sure I'm reading right — moving manure and litter to areas of feed and forage production. 03:14PM
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM simply because it's difficult to fill out the forms and keep track of all the paperwork and there's red tape and it's troublesome, so they say forget about it.  Q Is there enough money in Maryland to help everybody if they all came and applied at once?	brought up earlier today, where if you're growing grain to use your example, I think you said Iowa before. If you're growing grain in Iowa, should the litter they are proposing that if you're let me make sure I'm reading right moving manure and litter to areas of feed and forage production. 03:14PM Well, they're saying moving that manure and litter
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM simply because it's difficult to fill out the forms and keep track of all the paperwork and there's red tape and it's troublesome, so they say forget about it.  Q Is there enough money in Maryland to help everybody if they all came and applied at once?  A No.	brought up earlier today, where if you're growing grain to use your example, I think you said Iowa before. If you're growing grain in Iowa, should the litter they are proposing that if you're let me make sure I'm reading right moving manure and litter to areas of feed and forage production. 03:14PM Well, they're saying moving that manure and litter to where the grain came from or growing the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there are people who don't want to participate 03:12PM simply because it's difficult to fill out the forms and keep track of all the paperwork and there's red tape and it's troublesome, so they say forget about it.  Q Is there enough money in Maryland to help everybody if they all came and applied at once?  A No.  Q Okay. Let's go down to the conclusion heading	brought up earlier today, where if you're growing grain to use your example, I think you said Iowa before. If you're growing grain in Iowa, should the litter they are proposing that if you're let me make sure I'm reading right moving manure and litter to areas of feed and forage production. 03:14PM Well, they're saying moving that manure and litter to where the grain came from or growing the converse of that is growing grain locally where the

Α	So you can look at it either of two ways.	regions in the United States or worldwide where
Q	What would be the advantage of moving the	they're not producing now, then that is really
litte	r to where the grain comes from in our example,	something that is more like the theory of about how
Iowa	a?	the industry is operating, which I shouldn't even
	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 03:15PM	speak to. 03:17PM
A	In an ideal world, the phosphorus on a	Q Okay. Bottom paragraph in that column, can
phos	sphorus basis, the phosphorus would be returned	the transport of manure this is a rhetorical
to th	ne place from where it left the field when the	question or maybe not. Can the transport of manure
grain	n was produced, but yet there was phosphorus	within and among watersheds be encouraged to fully
intro	oduced to the fields in Iowa that was mined in 03:15PM	utilize this valuable P resource. The adoption of 03:17PM
cent	ral Florida from prehistoric deposits. So	manure hauling that links producers with buyers will
idea	ally we should if you're going to follow that	greatly enhance the sustainability of poultry
train	all the way back, you have to go back to where	operations over a larger geographic area. What does
the r	rock phosphate was mined and recreate historic	that mean?
depo	osits, which you can't do reversing geology. So 03:15PM	A I think, once again, it's referring back to 03:18PM
it ma	akes sense in an ideal world to move it back to	transporting litter from the location of production
whe	ere it came from, but to take the next step to	to a different area where they're not being produced
mov	e back to geologic formation where it was mined	and that may and being able to use it on a farm
orig	inally is kind of hard to fathom.	where there is no poultry production going on, and
Q	Well, if it were moved back to Iowa where the 03:15PM	that may enhance the sustainability of that 03:18PM
corn	n is growing	operation, of the poultry operation.
A	Right.	Q And that would be even among watersheds
Q	then the corn farmers in Iowa wouldn't have	according to this; right?
to be	e getting the rock phosphate from Florida?	A According to this, yes.
Α	If enough was moved back, yes. 03:16PM	Q Okay. Next column, second sentence first 03:18PM
	190	192
	TC 1 11 10	
Q A	If enough was moved back?	paragraph, second sentence, as with all confined
Q	Yes, sir.  And so basically the phosphorus would end up	animal feeding operations, sustainability of poultry operations hinges on reducing the P imbalances
_	ng recycled through the corn and the chickens	imbalance at farm and watershed scales through
	k to the corn? 03:16PM	carefully managed feeding strategies. How do you do 03:19PM
A	In an ideal world, that could work.	that at a watershed scale?
Q	And they're at least mentioning that here?	A I don't know.
A	Correct.	Q Can a farmer, individual farmer do that?
Q	Okay, and adoption and maintenance of	A My understanding is individual farmers have
_	ovative BMPs at farm and watershed scales. 03:16PM	very little control over their feed. 03:19PM
That	t's what you talked about before?	Q Last paragraph in that section, however, the
Α	Correct.	bottom line is still who will pay to adopt costly
Q	Next paragraph down, at some stage the	new strategies? Should the public who wants cheap
capa	acity of watersheds to assimilate nutrients	produce and clean water? Do you have any proposal
assu	ming some sort of transport of manure from P 03:16PM	that the public should pay for this? 03:19PM
rich	to P deficient areas should be determined and	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's
used	d as strategic planning of future development,	outside the scope of the opinions he's offered in
expa	ansion or realignment of poultry operations.	his report.
Wha	at's that mean?	A Well, that's really a public policy question.
A	This is really getting beyond my area of 03:17PM	I may I'll give you an example earlier in the 03:19PM
	erstanding, but I think they're talking about if	state of Maryland that in that in Maryland there
unde	ltry production regions were purposely moved from	was a public policy decision made that the State's
		I and the second
poul	ting regions to other regions in the United	Department of Agriculture was going to subsidize
poul	ting regions to other regions in the United es or worldwide or if expansion of production	Department of Agriculture was going to subsidize that, and that's a political policy governing
poul exist State		

1	Q Next question, should the integrators who are	concentration. Okay? Then Dr. Johnson took that	
2	meeting a market demand and profitability margins,	factor and applied it to data from the IRW. Okay?	
3	in your view, is there any role for the integrators	My overriding point is that there is, this, again,	
4	to help pay for this?	site-by-site variation out there, site-specific	
5	MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 03:20PM	differences where runoff may runoff water may or 03:3	7PM
6	A And the same example. The one example I'm	may not be generated and that if runoff water is	
7	familiar with, the integrators are playing a role.	generated, it may or may not reach a receiving body,	
8	Q Should they play a bigger role?	body of water. So I thought it was just a much too	
9	MR. McDANIEL: Objection, same objection.	gross over application, an application of the	
10	It's outside the scope of opinions offered in his 03:20PM	coefficient that Dr. Vadas came up with for a 03:37P	M
11	report.	different purpose.	
12	A I don't know what role they're playing now	Q Okay. Are you satisfied with the correctness	
13	quantitatively, so I don't know if it's big or	of what Dr. Vadas did?	
14	small.	A For the purposes of why he developed it, I	
15	MR. NANCE: Let's go ahead and break. 03:20PM	think it probably was adequate, yeah. 03:38PM	
16	MR. McDANIEL: Just a second before you go	Q Okay. I happen to have a copy of that report,	
17	off. Are you through with this exhibit?	as you might imagine. I've marked it as Exhibit 8.	
18	MR. NANCE: I think so.	A Okay.	
19	MR. McDANIEL: Okay. Well, then I just	Q And is that the paper that Dr. Vadas wrote	
20	want to put an objection on the Record under the 03:21PM		8PM
21	rule of completeness with regard to the sections of	A I believe it is, yes.	
22	the authors' discussion that you omitted from the	Q Okay. Let's look at the abstract of Dr.	
23	examination.	Vadas' paper there on the first page.	
24	MR. NANCE: Okay.	A Uh-huh.	
25	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record. 03:21PM	Q Down at the bottom about half a dozen lines up 03:.	39PM
	194	196	
1	The time is 3:22 p.m.	he says, overall, a single extraction coefficient,	
2	(Following a short recess at 3:22 p.m.,	2.0 for Mehlich III phosphorus data	
3	proceedings continued on the Record at 3:36 p.m.)	A Uh-huh.	
4	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.	Q 11.2 for water extractable phosphorus data	
5	The time is 3:36 p.m. 03:35PM	and a split line relationship for P sorption 03:39PM	
6 7	Q Dr. Coale, let's go back for a moment to your	saturation data could be used in water quality	
7 8	report on Page 10, Paragraph 7B.  A Uh-huh.	models to approximate dissolved P released from soil	
9	A Uh-huh.  Q In that paragraph, you take exception to	to runoff for the majority of soil, hydrologic or	
10	something that Dr. Johnson did, and if you could 03:35PM	management conditions.  A Uh-huh. 03:39PM	
11	just explain to me, please, in simplest terms	Q As far as that sentence goes, are you	
12	possible, what is your exception to what Dr. Johnson	satisfied that Dr. Vadas got it right?	
13	did?	A I wouldn't question he's a very good model	
14	A What the work that Dr. Johnson cited was	developer, and I think the point to remember there	
15	the work of Dr. Vadas, and Dr. Vadas developed 03:36PM	is saying that to be used in water quality models. 03:40P	M
16	for the purpose of developing large-scale models, he	That was the intent of this, and when you are	.,,
17	had to come up with see if he could come up with	developing a model again, I said previously I'm	
18	a single coefficient that related soil test P to	not a modeler, but modelers are always asking people	
19	soil soluble P and, therefore, P in runoff, and he	like me to help them develop a coefficient because	
	son soluble 1 and, therefore, 1 in funon, and he	L 111 111 1111	
20		they have to have some basis for deciding whether 20 03:4	40PM
	looked over many, many publications and datasets and 03:36PM	,	40PM
20	looked over many, many publications and datasets and put them all together, and in his paper he said that	percent of this goes into this pot or 13 goes in	40PM
20 21	looked over many, many publications and datasets and 03:36PM	percent of this goes into this pot or 13 goes in that pot or 40 percent goes in that pot when they	40PM
20 21 22	looked over many, many publications and datasets and 03:36PM put them all together, and in his paper he said that for the purpose — in Vadas' paper, for the purposes	percent of this goes into this pot or 13 goes in	40PM
20 21 22 23	looked over many, many publications and datasets and put them all together, and in his paper he said that for the purpose — in Vadas' paper, for the purposes of employing this in prediction models, that we	percent of this goes into this pot or 13 goes in that pot or 40 percent goes in that pot when they partition things out in a model, and they often	
20 21 22 23 24	looked over many, many publications and datasets and put them all together, and in his paper he said that for the purpose — in Vadas' paper, for the purposes of employing this in prediction models, that we would use a conversion factor, single conversion	percent of this goes into this pot or 13 goes in that pot or 40 percent goes in that pot when they partition things out in a model, and they often don't have that data. So they're often trying to	

1	exactly what this is. So it's for the purpose of	abstract
2	running these models.	A Right.
3	Q So since we've been talking Mehlich III	Q for Mehlich III?
4	A Right.	A Right.
5	Q let me just understand what Vadas said 03:41PM	Q And there are other coefficients for other 03:43PM
6	within the scope of his own work.	tests; right?
7	A Okay.	A Yes, you're right. That's just looking at one
8	Q This single extraction coefficient, and it's 2	component of a model that has I don't know how
9	for Mehlich III data; right?	many would have a wide variety of components.
10	A Well, that's what it says in the summary. 03:41PM	That is the coefficient that relates two factors in 03:44PM
11	Q Right.	one component of the model.
12	A But I think if you look it's a linear	Q Let me understand and, again, I know we're
13	regression equation. You have to look deeper down	talking very broad brush here.
14	in here for what the full relationship is if you are	A Okay.
15	going to try to use it with data points from real 03:41PM	Q The two times parts per million equals parts 03:44PM
16	sites.	per billion
17	Q Okay. Well, explain to me where in the	A Correct.
18	article I would look to see that.	Q is where; at the edge of the field for
19	A Well, I came up on this from Dr. Johnson's	purposes of the model, as water is running off the
20	report, and in Dr. Johnson's report he pulled a 03:41PM	field and it crosses over, is that 03:44PM
21	linear regression relationship from Vadas' work to	A For purposes of this model, I don't recall.
22	come up with the conversion, and if I recall	Q Okay.
23	correctly, it was the regression as represented in	A Honestly I don't. I'd have to go back and
24	Page 576, Figure 3. The regression equation that's	read that section over again, but it's wait a
25	in the bottom right-hand corner of that box of 03:42PM	minute. Since it's based on I can't say. It's 03:44PM
	198	200
1	Figure 3	based on a whole collection of data and most and
2	Q Uh-huh.	I'll make the generalization that most of that data
3	A I believe that's the equation that Dr.	is edge of plot, edge of field type data, so you
4	Johnson utilized that was in Johnson's report.	can't it's not a delivery coefficient to a creek
5	Q Okay. 03:42PM	or a stream or a lake or what have you, but it would 03:45PM
6	A And that's and if you take a broad view for	be a relationship between an STP in the soil and
7	a model application, they may truncate that equation	runoff if runoff was generated from that site,
8	just to say for modeling purposes let's just call it	what the soluble P in the runoff would be at the
9	two times because it's a very broad brush.	site.
10	Q At a very broad brush level, two times what 03:42PM	Q Well, that's what I thought. 03:45PM
11	equals what?	A That's what I think, too, but I honestly,
12	A It was two times let me look back at the	this is a little dense for me as far as there's a
13	units. Two times Mehlich III soil test P in	lot of modeling data and a lot of summaries and
14	milligrams per kilogram in a broad brush equals	calculations in here that you have to pick out what
15	runoff reactive phosphorus. 03:43PM	is the applied part of it. 03:45PM
16	Q In what unit?	Q Okay. So we've talked earlier about what may
17	A Micrograms per liter.	happen to runoff after it leaves a field. Various
18	Q Okay. Two times milligrams per liter?	things may happen?
19	A No. Two times parts per million.	A Correct.
20	Q Okay. Two times parts per million? 03:43PM	Q But am I hearing you correctly that Vadas says 03:45PM
21	A Milligrams per kilogram.	at the edge of the field, as it leaves to go on its
22	Q Okay. Equals	way whenever it's going, this two times parts per
23	A Micrograms per liter.	million equals the parts per billion is a broad
24	Q Okay. That's the that's the single	brush coefficient?
25	extraction coefficient that he talks about in his 03:43PM	A I think if I think the brush is a little 03:46PM
	199	201

1	broader than that. I think it's the broad brush	with the coefficient to be used in modeling, and
2	coefficient is saying that at that point in space	those coefficients are always very rough and very
3	where that soil sample is analyzed, and then you can	approximating, and they're saying, well, they think
4	say if runoff is entered at that point in space, was	they have a coefficient here that can be utilized
5	the center of the field, the edge of the field or 03:46PM	for the purpose of modeling. I would and I don't 03:49PM
6	where it may be. At that point in space, you could	recall them saying and I don't see it reading here.
7	use this broad brush to X coefficient to predict	I would suspect that they would caution against
8	what the runoff P concentration may be at that site.	applying it to real world data on a
9	It's a very general conversion.	data-point-by-data-point basis using a conversion
10	Q But, I assume, helpful in the modeling 03:46PM	because I think they said it over and over again. 03:50PM
11	business?	It's for the purpose of developing these broad
12	A I hope so because it sure is hard to get.	watershed models.
13	Yeah, I assume it is, too.	Q Is accuracy important for developing broad
14	Q All right. Let's look just for a moment at	watershed models?
15	578. In the conclusions column there on the 03:47PM	A Well, you again, I'm not a modeler. You 03:50PM
16	right-hand side	want them to be as accurate as possible, but they
17	A Uh-huh.	are very gross approximations, which are very
18	Q about halfway down that first long	difficult to precisely partake on a particular site.
19	paragraph, a sentence begins therefore. Therefore	So they're not accurate. It's it's as accurate
20	the agronomic Mehlich III and Bray 1, do you see 03:47PM	as they can be but they're not very accurate. 03:50PM
21	that, Doctor?	Q And Vadas and his co-authors crunched data
22	A Yes, yes.	from seventeen states; right?
23	Q And Bray 1 soils tests are equally, if not	A They looked at a lot of work.
24	more effective, for evaluating potential for soils	Q Had plenty of data to work with?
25	to release dissolved P to runoff as the 03:48PM	A Right. 03:50PM
	202	204
1	environmentally oriented water extraction test.	Q Okay. Do you have any disagreement with the
2	What does that mean?	sentence I read, and if I need to read it again, I
3	A I don't know what that means.	will, with the one about the assumption that P
		· ·
4	Q Okay.	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types,
4 5	Q Okay. A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM	_ ·
		extraction coefficients are specific to soil types,
5	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM
5 6	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a
5 6 7 8 9	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management
5 6 7 8 9	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM
5 6 7 8 9 10	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a 03:48PM	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model 03:51PM
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a 03:48PM single value for an extraction coefficient relating	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model 03:51PM accuracy. Do you disagree with that?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a single value for an extraction coefficient relating soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model 03:51PM accuracy. Do you disagree with that? A It's, in my mind, a reiteration of what we
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a single value for an extraction coefficient relating soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology for management	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM  A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model 03:51PM accuracy. Do you disagree with that? A It's, in my mind, a reiteration of what we just talked about. Their goal was to reduce the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a single value for an extraction coefficient relating soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology for management scenarios.	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong?  A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine.  Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model accuracy. Do you disagree with that?  A It's, in my mind, a reiteration of what we just talked about. Their goal was to reduce the complexity so, yes, it makes it simple, and in their
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a single value for an extraction coefficient relating soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology for management scenarios.  A Uh-huh. 03:49PM	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM  A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model accuracy. Do you disagree with that? A It's, in my mind, a reiteration of what we just talked about. Their goal was to reduce the complexity so, yes, it makes it simple, and in their their modeling expertise, saying it didn't 03:51PM
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a single value for an extraction coefficient relating soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology for management scenarios.  A Uh-huh. 03:49PM  Q Are the authors of this study, Vadas,	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM  A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model accuracy. Do you disagree with that?  A It's, in my mind, a reiteration of what we just talked about. Their goal was to reduce the complexity so, yes, it makes it simple, and in their their modeling expertise, saying it didn't 03:51PM sacrifice accuracy of the model.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a 03:48PM single value for an extraction coefficient relating soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology for management scenarios.  A Uh-huh. 03:49PM  Q Are the authors of this study, Vadas, Kleinman, Sharpley and Turner, telling us that it's	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model 03:51PM accuracy. Do you disagree with that? A It's, in my mind, a reiteration of what we just talked about. Their goal was to reduce the complexity so, yes, it makes it simple, and in their their modeling expertise, saying it didn't 03:51PM sacrifice accuracy of the model. Q So it can be simple and accurate?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a 03:48PM single value for an extraction coefficient relating soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology for management scenarios.  A Uh-huh. 03:49PM  Q Are the authors of this study, Vadas, Kleinman, Sharpley and Turner, telling us that it's simpler than we used to think it was?	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM  A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model accuracy. Do you disagree with that? A It's, in my mind, a reiteration of what we just talked about. Their goal was to reduce the complexity so, yes, it makes it simple, and in their their modeling expertise, saying it didn't 03:51PM sacrifice accuracy of the model. Q So it can be simple and accurate? A For these modeling purposes.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a 03:48PM single value for an extraction coefficient relating soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology for management scenarios.  A Uh-huh. 03:49PM  Q Are the authors of this study, Vadas, Kleinman, Sharpley and Turner, telling us that it's simpler than we used to think it was?  A No. They're saying that — they're giving	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM  A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine.  Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model accuracy. Do you disagree with that?  A It's, in my mind, a reiteration of what we just talked about. Their goal was to reduce the complexity so, yes, it makes it simple, and in their their modeling expertise, saying it didn't 03:51PM sacrifice accuracy of the model.  Q So it can be simple and accurate?  A For these modeling purposes.  Q Okay. Let's look at your report, Section 7C
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A I don't recall reading it before. 03:48PM  Q Let's go down into the next sentence or the next paragraph, sir. The final paragraph of the conclusions section, just above midway there, there is a sentence that begins the assumption that P extraction coefficients; do you see that? 03:48PM  A Yes.  Q Okay. The assumption that P extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown that a 03:48PM single value for an extraction coefficient relating soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology for management scenarios.  A Uh-huh. 03:49PM  Q Are the authors of this study, Vadas, Kleinman, Sharpley and Turner, telling us that it's simpler than we used to think it was?	extraction coefficients are specific to soil types, runoff conditions or management practices implies 03:51PM greater complexity for modeling, but we have shown a single value for an extraction coefficient relating to soil P to dissolved P in runoff can be used across a wide range of soil hydrology or management scenarios. Are they wrong? 03:51PM  A No. I'm saying for the purpose of developing their models, they are probably fine. Q Okay. Last sentence in the article, thus, predicting dissolved P loss from soil to runoff can apparently remain simple without sacrificing model accuracy. Do you disagree with that? A It's, in my mind, a reiteration of what we just talked about. Their goal was to reduce the complexity so, yes, it makes it simple, and in their their modeling expertise, saying it didn't 03:51PM sacrifice accuracy of the model. Q So it can be simple and accurate? A For these modeling purposes.

i		l .
1	A Okay.	had anything to do with this 19 parts per million in
2	Q Now he's talking about something that he's	B.
3	talked about earlier and the math that Dr. Johnson	Q Okay. Why didn't it?
4	used.	A Well, let me go back and read the report.
5	A Uh-huh. 03:52PM	Q Okay. 03:56PM
6	Q We may have to get his report to fully	A If you I think my the point I was making
7	understand this. I just want to make sure we get	was pertinent to Paragraph C, where if the runoff P
8	the math right here, and if we want to make this an	was .038 parts per million, which is the same as 38
9	exhibit, we can, but I'll just show you this. This	parts per billion, and you substitute that for Y and
10	is I think 10C, the paragraph you were talking 03:53PM	do the algebra and X, which is the soil test P in 03:57PM
11	about; right?	parts per million, would come out to Mehlich III.
12	A From Dr. Johnson's report?	Q .038 parts per million
13	Q Yeah, this is Dr. Johnson's report. Let's	A Correct.
14	back up and look at 10B because I think that gives	Q would be what in parts per billion?
15	us a number we need to use. He says, the average 03:53PM	A 38. 03:58PM
16	STP value was 38 pounds per acre from forage land	Q So let's do it broad brush and then let's do
17	sampled, and I'm not asking you to agree with that	this this way. We're going to do it two ways.
18	figure, but I'm just telling you that's what he	Okay?
19	started with, and you can read and satisfy yourself	A Okay.
20	that that's what he said. 03:54PM	Q If we're starting out with 19 parts per 03:58PM
21	A Okay. I understand that.	million
22	Q Okay. Now, again, in Oklahoma if we're	A That's not where I started. I started using
23	talking 38 pounds per acre, we would do it	this what I referenced was this paragraph under
24	backwards. We'd divide by two to gets to parts per	Paragraph C
25	million? 03:54PM	Q Uh-huh. 03:58PM
	206	208
1	A Correct.	A using the data presented there. That's
2	Q And that would be 19?	what I had the exception with.
3	A Correct.	Q Okay. Well, here's the calculation I'd like
4	Q So that math is correct; right?	to do right now in realtime.
5	A Yes. 03:54PM	A Okay. Go ahead. 03:58PM
6	Q Okay. Let me get where I can then he talks	Q Because he's talking here in C about counties
7	about Vadas, and he goes down here, using the	with less than a thousand tons, and that's what he's
8	prediction equation from this publication, two times	talking about up here in B.
9	parts per million STP equals parts per billion	A Okay.
10 11	runoff? 03:54PM	Q Same figure. Up here he tells you, and I'm 03:59PM
12	A Right. He gives that's the prediction equation right there.	not asking you to agree with the accuracy of these numbers. I just want to make sure we get the math
13		right.
14	Q Okay, all right. We're going to get there in just a moment. This is the broad brush up here, the	A Okay. 19 parts per million soil test P.
15	two times parts per million equals parts per 03:54PM	Q Right. Using the Vadas broad brush equation, 03:59PM
16	billion?	the two the single extraction coefficient times
17	A Right.	two
18	Q Okay. So broad brush, using that, if we're	A Which is this equation here.
19	plugging in this figure up here, 19 parts per	Q We'll talk about that in a minute. Just a
20	million, what would we get as our parts per billion? 03:55PM	simple two, two times 19 parts per million would be? 03:59PM
21	MR. McDANIEL: You're asking him based upon	A 38.
22	the chart in Dr. Johnson's report?	Q 38 parts per billion, and is that the same as
23	MR. NANCE: I'm just asking him based upon	.038 parts per million?
24	the arithmetic and the two times coefficient.	A Yes, it is.
25	A I don't believe the point I made in my report 03:55PM	Q Okay. So using the broad brush equation, 03:59PM
	* *	·

		1
1	that's what you get; right?	there in that text above the graph?
2	A Right, if you take the Y intercept factor out	A In the text, yes, two times use the broad
3	of this regression equation that he presented here.	brush in the text.
4	Q Right, and if do you understand what he	Q Okay.
5	did? 04:00PM	A And then presented the other more precise 04:02PM
6	A I understand that he took the broad brush that	equation in the figure.
7	was presented in this abstract of this paper and	Q Okay. So for using the broad brush, he got
8	used that, but then, as I said a couple of times	the math right?
9	now, the problem I had with it was presenting this	A Yes.
10	regression equation and then talking about it when 04:00PM	Q Okay, but he could have used a more precise 04:02PM
11	the math didn't add up, didn't make sense.	version and gotten a different number?
12	Q Okay.	A Yes.
13	A He never mentioned about the broad brush	Q Okay.
14	approach versus the specific approach. He gave a	A And ignored the precision in the process.
15	very specific equation that I couldn't match the 04:00PM	Q I understand that's your opinion. 04:02PM
16	math. That's why I had a problem.	A Okay.
17	Q Well, but, Dr. Coale, he referenced the broad	Q Now, in 7E, which is on Page 11, you talk
18	brush right there.	about a conversation you had with Dr. Vadas.
19	A Where?	A Yes.
20	Q Using the prediction equation from the 04:00PM	Q Tell me about that conversation, please. 04:03PM
21	publication, parentheses, two times PPM, underlined,	A Dr. Vadas and I both attended the SERA-17
22	STP, equals PPB, underline, runoff P. That's the	meeting last summer, and that was immediately
23	broad brush right there, isn't it?	following when I received this information from Dr.
24	A But this is the real equation.	Johnson's report. So I took that opportunity to run
25	MR. McDANIEL: Be specific about what this 04:00PM	
	210	212
1	is when you gentlemen are pointing.	Vadas' work to get the first level off his opinion
2	A Oh. I'm referring to in Dr. Johnson's report	of whether it had been properly interpreted.
3	in paragraph Subparagraph C on Page 19 that	Q And what was said between the two of you?
4	there's a graph, there's a figure that shows	A Well, I think the pertinent parts of what was
5	relationship between Mehlich III STP and runoff P 04:01PM	
6	and micrograms per liter.	that basically he thinks that Dr. Johnson
7	Q All right.	interpreted properly, didn't make any errors
8	A And there's a single linear relationship shown	interpreting that conversion equation, but he
9	with an equation describing that relationship, and	thought that the application of that interpretation
10	that's the equation I used in my calculations where 04:01PM	to real life data and real scenarios in the field 04:04PM
11	I couldn't understand where he got his numbers from.	was over simplistic.
12	Q Okay.	Q Okay. What did you give Dr. Vadas for him to
13	A Now, back to the broad brush approach you were	look at?
14	talking about, that truncates his equation, makes it	A I gave him there in Subparagraph E, I put
15	less precise and just makes it more in line with a 04:01PM	where I showed Section 10C, 10D and 10E from Dr. 04:04PM
16	more general overview of the modeling approach that	Vadas' report, and I didn't tell him where it was
17	was taken. The exception I had this is a much	from. I just cut them out and showed them to him.
18	more precise conversion. So if you're going apply	Q Okay. Towards the bottom of 10E in your
19	this conversion from specific data from the specific	report
20	watershed from a specific soil test, you should use 04:01PM	MR. McDANIEL: 6E? 04:05PM
21	the most precise conversion equation that you have	MR. NANCE: Excuse me. 6E, you are
22	available.	correct.
23	Q I understand that's your testimony and belief.	Q It says about six lines from the bottom, Dr.
24	But you told me a minute ago he didn't use the broad	Vadas concluded that Dr. Johnson utilized Dr. Vadas'
25	brush, and he did, didn't he, because it's right 04:02PM	published research in an attempt to demonstrate that 04:05PM
	211	213

He is saying that this is the relationship tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, thout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied.  So if you try to take all that into insideration, it becomes too complex, and that's of what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted assolved P concentration, absent a recently applied anure application.  Because if there's a recently applied manure oplication and there's runoff, the dissolved P, the RP is a great deal more?  Not necessarily more, but it's no longer — otionentration falls apart.  Well, it is more, though, isn't it? Typically it's more.  If you lay down fresh manure and it rains, are  04:08PM	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on that prediction and we don't know how to do it. That's my interpretation of what is meant by that.  Q Modelers generally don't know how to deal of the fresh litter application?  A I didn't say that. There may be some modelers who are very good at it, but that's my interpretation of what Vadas said to me in his E-mail.  Q Well, are there modelers out there that know how to deal with fresh litter application?	04:11PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM (thout the complicating factor that if you have a shly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM So if you try to take all that into insideration, it becomes too complex, and that's but what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted issolved P concentration, absent a recently applied anure application.  Because if there's a recently applied manure oplication and there's runoff, the dissolved P, the RP is a great deal more?  Not necessarily more, but it's no longer 04:08PM e relationship between soil test P and that runoff concentration falls apart.  Well, it is more, though, isn't it?  Typically it's more.	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on that prediction and we don't know how to do it. That's my interpretation of what is meant by that.  Q Modelers generally don't know how to deal where the properties of the properties of the properties who are very good at it, but that's my interpretation of what Vadas said to me in his E-mail.  Q Well, are there modelers out there that know	04:10PM vith 04:11PM
the tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, o4:07PM (thout the complicating factor that if you have a shly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM So if you try to take all that into insideration, it becomes too complex, and that's of what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted issolved P concentration, absent a recently applied of anure application.  Because if there's a recently applied manure oplication and there's runoff, the dissolved P, the RP is a great deal more?  Not necessarily more, but it's no longer 04:08PM is relationship between soil test P and that runoff concentration falls apart.  Well, it is more, though, isn't it?	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on that prediction and we don't know how to do it. That's my interpretation of what is meant by that.  Q Modelers generally don't know how to deal where the fresh litter application?  A I didn't say that. There may be some modelers who are very good at it, but that's my interpretation of what Vadas said to me in his E-mail.	04:10PM vith 04:11PM
the tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, o4:07PM thout the complicating factor that if you have a shly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM So if you try to take all that into insideration, it becomes too complex, and that's it what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted issolved P concentration, absent a recently applied of anure application.  Because if there's a recently applied manure in the polication and there's runoff, the dissolved P, the in the polication and there's runoff the polication and the	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on that prediction and we don't know how to do it. That's my interpretation of what is meant by that.  Q Modelers generally don't know how to deal versh litter application?  A I didn't say that. There may be some modelers who are very good at it, but that's my interpretation of what Vadas said to me in his	04:10PM vith
the tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, of thout the complicating factor that if you have a seshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM  So if you try to take all that into insideration, it becomes too complex, and that's at what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted issolved P concentration, absent a recently applied in anure application.  Because if there's a recently applied manure oplication and there's runoff, the dissolved P, the interest and the property of the interest of the property	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on that prediction and we don't know how to do it.  That's my interpretation of what is meant by that.  Q Modelers generally don't know how to deal we fresh litter application?  A I didn't say that. There may be some modelers who are very good at it, but that's my	04:10PM vith
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay,  othout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied.  So if you try to take all that into onsideration, it becomes too complex, and that's at what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted assolved P concentration, absent a recently applied onure application.  Because if there's a recently applied manure oplication and there's runoff, the dissolved P, the RP is a great deal more?  Not necessarily more, but it's no longer  04:08PM	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on that prediction and we don't know how to do it. That's my interpretation of what is meant by that.  Q Modelers generally don't know how to deal when the fresh litter application?  A I didn't say that. There may be some modelers	04:10PM vith
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay,  othout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied.  So if you try to take all that into onsideration, it becomes too complex, and that's at what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted ssolved P concentration, absent a recently applied anure application.  Because if there's a recently applied manure epplication and there's runoff, the dissolved P, the RP is a great deal more?	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on that prediction and we don't know how to do it.  That's my interpretation of what is meant by that.  Q Modelers generally don't know how to deal we have a manure is applied.	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, thout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied.  So if you try to take all that into ensideration, it becomes too complex, and that's of what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted essolved P concentration, absent a recently applied anure application.  Because if there's a recently applied manure	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on that prediction and we don't know how to do it.  That's my interpretation of what is meant by that.	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, thout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied.  So if you try to take all that into ensideration, it becomes too complex, and that's but what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted essolved P concentration, absent a recently applied o4:08PM anure application.	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on that prediction and we don't know how to do it.	
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM without the complicating factor that if you have a shly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM So if you try to take all that into insideration, it becomes too complex, and that's at what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted ssolved P concentration, absent a recently applied 04:08PM	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when fresh manure is applied, we've lost that handle on	
the tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM thout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM So if you try to take all that into insideration, it becomes too complex, and that's of what it refers to. It refers to just the lationship between soil test P and this predicted	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have an idea what the controlling factors are, but when	
the tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM thout the complicating factor that if you have a shly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM So if you try to take all that into ensideration, it becomes too complex, and that's but what it refers to. It refers to just the	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a fresh manure application and runoff so we can have	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM thout the complicating factor that if you have a shly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM So if you try to take all that into insideration, it becomes too complex, and that's	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but we're just looking at the soil test level without a	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM ithout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM So if you try to take all that into	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point behind he says we think we know how to do it but	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM without the complicating factor that if you have a easily applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the anure that's applied. 04:08PM	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of sophistication. I think that's the whole point	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, thout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the lubility and that quantity of the soluble P in the	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure applied. They're not up to that level of	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM thout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that lationship falls apart and is controlled by the	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out how to do that yet if there's been a fresh manure	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM thout the complicating factor that if you have a eshly applied manure application, that that	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to use in his models. That he hasn't figured out	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM ithout the complicating factor that if you have a	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are attempting to develop a modeling a coefficient to	04:10PM
tween an STP and dissolved P in runoff, okay, 04:07PM	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is trying to make here, that in his purposes they are	04:10PM
	difference would be, but I think the point Vadas is	04:10PM
He is saying that this is the relationship	_	
opened. What are the worms in that can, Doctor?	A I couldn't venture a guess on what the	
at is a whole other can of worms better left		
implies that STP is controlling runoff DRP, but	dissolved phosphorus is, what, an order of magnit	ude
214	216	
		04:09PM
	1 -	
•		
•	1 -	
om your considered materials?	11	
khibit No. 9. Do you recognize that as an E-mail	application.	
Okay. Let me show you what I've marked as 04:06PM	of a freshly applied manure sample manure	04:09PM
We would expect that to be true.	paper talks about is without the compounding factor	
your scientific field?		
	I .	
nsensus would be that's true.		
	· •	04:09PM
~ *	I .	
	I .	
ience?		
-	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
		04:09PM
•		
	1	
	I would call that common knowledge, yes.  Everybody knows that?  I won't say every individual but, yes, the 04:06PM asensus would be that's true.  And that would be an indisputable conclusion your scientific field?  We would expect that to be true.  Okay. Let me show you what I've marked as hibit No. 9. Do you recognize that as an E-mail mr your considered materials?  Yes.  And is this Dr. Vadas' answer basically to ur inquiry? 04:06PM  Yes.  Okay. I'd like you to explain to me, if you n, what the next to the last paragraph means, ally, this whole analysis ignores the attribution of manure itself to DRP loss in runoff. 214  implies that STP is controlling runoff DRP, but at is a whole other can of worms better left	dissolved phosphorus than before you laid down the manure?  A Typically it would be higher.  Q Okay, and it would be higher?  A I guess it depends on how much manure was put on it and what the site of the P was.  I would call that common knowledge, yes.  Everybody knows that?  I won't say every individual but, yes, the 04:06PM asensus would be that's true.  And that would be an indisputable conclusion your scientific field?  We would expect that to be true.  Okay. Let me show you what I've marked as whibit No. 9. Do you recognize that as an E-mail my our considered materials?  Yes.  And is this Dr. Vadas' answer basically to ar inquiry?  Okay. I'd like you to explain to me, if you a, what the next to the last paragraph means, ally, this whole analysis ignores the attribution of manure itself to DRP loss in runoff.  214  dissolved phosphorus than before you laid down the manure?  A Typically it would be higher.  Q Okay, and it would be higher.  Q Okay, and it would be a lot higher?  A I guess it depends on how much manure was put on it and what the sit of the P was.  Q Okay. Why is that can of worms better left unopend?  A My presumption is from that, that if they tried to model that — they haven't figured out how to do that yet in the modeling world. That relationship between soil test P that his whole paper talks about is without the compounding factor of a freshly applied manure sample — manure application.  Q Isn't there plenty of research that shows the relationship between the dissolved phosphorus in the runoff and the dissolved phosphorus in the litter?  A Yes. O4:09PM  A Yes. O4:09PM  A Yes. O4:09PM  A That's shown in the litterature, yes.  A Right.  Q And many times?  A Right.  A That's shown in the litter is put down on land, the 214  dissolved phosphorus is, what, an order of magnit more of what it would be off the same land's STP?

1	A That's beyond what I can speculate on.	evaluation as a higher risk loss situation, and
2	Q Paragraph 7 beginning on Page 11 in your	those are the sites where you should focus best
3	report is it's entitled Site-Specific	management practices, et cetera, so that you can
4	Determination of Risk.	help reduce that loss.
5	A Uh-huh. 04:11PM	Part of a P index is I mean, something to 04:14PM
6	Q In fact, this is the second Paragraph 7 in	remember is it's using the planning process, so it's
7	your report; right?	a scenario, it's a what if. It's a scenario
8	A I don't know that.	evaluation. So you run the scenario evaluation and
9	MR. McDANIEL: Yikes.	you say, well, I gave a certain it has a certain
10	A Well, that would be my blunder, yes, sir. 04:12PM	relative risk outcome when you do the assessment, 04:14PM
11	Q Okay.	and then you go back and say, well, where in my
12	MR. McDANIEL: Can we agree on some	assessment did I identify a substantial part of my
13	designation for purposes of the Record so it won't	risk for P loss is coming from, and then you go back
14	be too confusing?	with the farmer and say what management practices
15	Q 7 on Page 11? 04:12PM	can be modified, changed, adopted, what have you, to 04:15PM
16	A 7-11.	help reduce the component of the risk.
17	Q Okay. It has a certain rhyme to it.	Q Okay. You say in 7B 7-11B at the bottom of
18	A I've heard it before.	Page 11, that both Oklahoma and Arkansas have
19	Q Again, very broad brush, Dr. Coale, what's the	adopted P index evaluation tools?
20	point of a phosphorus index? 04:12PM	A Right. 04:15PM
21	A Broad brush of a phosphorus index is a tool	Q What's the Oklahoma P index evaluation tool?
22	used in the nutrient management planning process to	A That's essentially the Code 590 standard.
23	look at projected management decisions being made on	Q Okay, and is it like the phosphorus indices in
24	the farm and to decide whether those management	other states?
25	decisions were resolved in a relatively low, 04:12PM	A It's the premise behind it is similar. 04:15PM
	218	220
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	relatively medium, relatively high, very high risk for phosphorus loss from that piece of land.  Q Is a phosphorus index always used at the farm level?  A No. It's designed to be used at the field 04:13PM level.  Q At the field level. Let's go up from the farm level. Is it designed to be used at a watershed level?  A No. 04:13PM  Q Tell me what you mean in the phosphorus index context of a critical source area.  A A critical source area is a term that's been coined that represents where you have the intersection of — on a particular field, of course, 04:13PM subfield, you have the intersection of a large phosphorus source. There's a lot of phosphorus in the soil, and you have a high transport potential.  So you have both a lot of phosphorus present and a	Q And what's the upper limit for land application of poultry litter in a nutrient limited watershed in Oklahoma? A If the STP is greater than 300 I believe, there's a no application limit. 04:16PM Q And it's 300 pound per acre in Oklahoma? A I believe that's correct. I believe 590 is correct. Q What's the scientific basis behind that? A I don't know. 04:16PM Q Who would know? A NRCS staff in Oklahoma. Q All right. Have you ever seen any scientific research that supports that? A I don't know how it was derived. 04:16PM Q So you haven't seen any research that supports it? A No. Q Okay. How does the Arkansas phosphorus index
20	high potential to transport it off. 04:14PM	work? 04:17PM
21	Q Okay, and what does a phosphorus index counsel	A It similarly assesses risk potential due to a
22	us to do about a critical source area?	number of factors that characterize the source
23	A What does it counsel us to do about it? Those	material, solubility, rate of application, et
24	are the sites where you would have a critical	cetera, et cetera, and a series of characteristics
25	source area should show up on a phosphorus index 04:14PM	that evaluate the transport potential for moving it 04:17PM
	219	221

1	off landscape would be slope, erosion and those kind	it, none, low, medium, high, very high?
2	of things.	A I assume it does.
3	Q Are you personally familiar with the Arkansas	Q Okay. The first line here that has site
4	phosphorus index?	transport characteristics, do you see that?
5	A Not intimately, but I've seen it and have an 04:17PM	A Yeah. 04:20PM
6	idea how it's structured.	Q In this particular phosphorus index or is that
7	Q Have you seen it written out or is it in the	just a label for the two entries below it?
8	form of software?	A No. It's a label for the three entries below
9	A It's written out. I've not seen the software.	it.
10	Q Where is it written out? 04:17PM	Q Soil erosion, runoff class and return period 04:20PM
11	A A publication by DeLaune I believe where I saw	distance?
12	it.	A Correct.
13	Q About 2004?	Q Okay.
14	A I don't recall the date, but that might be	A Well, wait a minute. Return period
15	approximately right. 04:17PM	distances is a separate one. That would be a header 04:20PM
16	Q We've got in some of the exhibits we	for soil erosion and runoff class.
17	already have, we have an example of a phosphorus	Q Okay. So soil erosion, there are a number of
18	index, and that would be in this exhibit. I don't	categories to the right of soil erosion. One is
19	have it by number. Let's find it. G-B-U-R-E-K,	weight, which is 1.0.
20	pronounce that for me. 04:18PM	A Correct. 04:21PM
21	A Gburek.	Q The first category, the first column after
22	Q Gburek. Looks like 6.	weight is none where it says not applicable.
23	A Okay.	A Uh-huh.
24	Q Let's turn over to Page 137 of that article.	Q What does that mean?
25	A Uh-huh. 04:18PM	A And this is just my interpretation of this as 04:21PM
	222	224
1	Q Have you seen that Table 4 before?	it's printed here, that there is not a situation
2	A I've seen it in this article before.	where that would apply.
3	Q Okay. Is this Table 4 typical of a phosphorus	Q Would that mean
4	index that might be used around the country?	A That no site is going to get a none reading.
5	A This looks like the phosphorus index that was 04:19PM	Q Gotcha. I'm with you. So low then is less 04:21PM
6	adopted in Pennsylvania. Now, different states,	than 10 milligrams per hectare?
7	regions have developed phosphorus indices which look	A Megagrams right there.
8	a little bit different from one another. They have	Q Megagrams?
9	a little different structure, little different math,	A Metric tons.
10	but the concept behind them are all pretty uniform. 04:19PM	Q Metric tons. I guess that would be a bigger 04:21PM
11	Q Okay.	than a milligram, wouldn't it?
12	A So I wouldn't promise, but I think this looks	A A whole lot bigger.
13	like the Pennsylvania one, which I have seen once or	Q 10 metric tons per hectare is low erosion; am
14	twice or three times, not a lot.	I reading that correctly?
15	Q You would not be surprised to hear that I need 04:19PM	A Yes. 04:22PM
16	a little help understanding this.	Q Medium is 10 to 20 megagrams?
17	A Yeah. This one is confusing.	A Correct.
18	Q Let's walk through it slowly together, if we	Q High is 20 to 30?
19	could, please.	A Correct.
20	A Okay.	Q And very high is over 30 metric tons per 04:22PM
21	Q Across the very top, I guess once you get	hectare?
22	into it, there's something called P loss rating	A Correct.
23	value.	Q Okay. How does a metric ton compare to a
24	A Uh-huh.	is it an imperial ton?
25	Q Okay. Now, does that refer to the line below 04:20PM	A It's a thousand kilograms. 04:22PM
	223	225

1	Q Okay. A kilogram is about 2.2 pounds?	Q Is let me ask it another way. Somewhere is
2	A Right.	there data that forms a curve that breaks at various
3	Q How do you arrive at these numerical	places and those breaks are incorporated into this
4	designations for low, medium, high and very high	tool for runoff?
5	when it comes to soil erosion? 04:22PM	A I can't answer that. I don't know. 04:25PM
6	A The weights I'm not familiar what	Q Just as a general proposition, in the PI
7	numerical designation are you referring to?	writing business
8	Q Well, less than 10, 10 to 20, 20 to 30, over	A Right.
9	30.	Q is there empirically distinguishable points
10	A Right.	of data that support these categories generally, not 04:26PM
11	Q Is there some scientific breakpoint before 10	wedded to Pennsylvania but
12	and 10 to 20?	A A lot of the distinctions between the
13	A No. I believe those are just segments of a	categories, low, medium, high, et cetera,
14	continuum.	categories, are based on either a couple of
15	Q So it's not based on some empirical difference 04:23PM	different scenarios I can think of. One is you have 04:26PM
16	out there in the real world?	a continuum of response and you say, well, we
17	A No.	believe, based on professional judgment, whoever
18	Q Okay. Runoff class, what does negligible mean	made the judgment is that we believe that response
19	under the none column?	is equally distributed from the minimal to the
20	A Well, I'd have to go back and look at where 04:23PM	maximal point. So you divide it into four equal 04:26PM
21	I don't think we have all the information here in	sections or five equal sections, whatever it might
22	this publication. Negligible would be the name of a	be.
23	runoff class where runoff would be negligible.	Other times there may be a situation where you
24	Q Okay.	think it is not equally distributed. So like under
25	A Now, how quantitatively that's calculated, I 04:23PM	that soil erosion, these authors apparently, from my 04:26PM
	226	228
1	don't think that's presented yet. You'd have to go	interpretation, decided that there was really
2	back to if this is the Pennsylvania P index,	nothing that there was no situations which were
3	you'd have to go back to that document to figure out	should have a zero because there's no such thing
4	how that was done.	as a zero erosion potential in any site. There's
5	Q All right. Do you know the scientific basis 04:24PM	always some erosion potential. So they said, well, 04:26PM
6	between the very low or low category, what that is	we're going to truncate the bottom into that scale
7	in a numerical quantification of runoff?	off, and it's based on a lot of professional
8	A It's first answer is, no, I don't know what	judgment and a lot of collective knowledge, and
9	how that's calculated, don't know what it means,	sometimes not you're not going to find
10	but it's saying that the run the expected runoff 04:24PM	quantitative backing for every decision that's made 04:27PM
11	I would interpret it to mean the expected water	in how these are distributed.
12	runoff from that site was in the first category	Q Okay. In the environmental science field,
13	would be negligible, they wouldn't expect any, and	what's the numerical unit or the unit of measurement
14	the next category would be very low or low, and then	you used to measure runoff? I mean, up here it's
15	it gets relatively higher as you go up the scale, 04:24PM	megagrams per hectare. 04:27PM
16	the potential for surface runoff water to be	A For erosion.
17	generated.	Q For erosion?
18	Q All right. In the science that you do	A Right.
19	A Uh-huh.	Q What's the similar unit for just in your
20	Q are there scientific breakpoints that are 04:25PM	business for runoff? 04:27PM
21	associated with very low or low runoff, medium	A Well, it depends on whether you are talking
	runoff, high runoff, very high runoff?	about total load of runoff. It would be it could
22		1
22 23	A It's usually a continuum, and then in	be cubic meters per hectare, and that would be the
	different applications, they may be segmented into	quantity of water left in a certain area. Okay?
23	•	

1	that would be one unit. There's different units,	from the water. So you're a long way from water.
2	but this is a class. This is a classification	Q So if would I have it correctly, if you are
3	variable. It's not a continuous quantitative	trying to figure the risk of a storm, a big ten-year
4	variable. So this is just descriptive, a	storm
5	descriptive variable of a situation into a category. 04:28PM	A Uh-huh. 04:30PM
6	There's no units on it.	Q and presumably every storm less than
7	Q Well, I see that. I was wondering if there	that
8	were units behind it.	A Right.
9	A No.	Q you would move back 170 meters from the
10	Q Okay. Return period distance, this one makes 04:28PM	stream? 04:30PM
11	my head hurt.	A No. I think they're taken together, and this
12	A Mine, too. This is very confusing.	is where I'm going to have to profess, I don't
13	Q We're both going to have Tylenol before we are	understand how that's done.
14	done here. I mean, I can see the none, low, medium,	Q Okay. Because I notice as we just work across
15	high and very high categories across the top of that 04:28PM	there 04:30PM
16	section, and I see they've been assigned numbers.	A Right.
17	What's a greater than ten-year return period?	Q if it says less than one year, it's less
18	That's the first category; right?	than 30 meters at the far right end of that same
19	A Right.	line; do vou see that?
20	Q I mean, that's a time period obviously. What 04:28PM	A Right, and those are two different 04:31PM
21	does that mean?	measurements, a frequent storm event and close to
22	A If my recollection is correct and, again, I	the river close to the stream.
23	don't use this type of data, that a storm event, a	Q So the kind of storms you get every year are
24	rain event that would generate runoff, expected to	more common than ten-year storms?
25	generate runoff would occur the frequency would 04:29PM	A Well, I think the interpretation is and, 04:31PM
	230	232
1	be less well, it would be greater than the	again, I'm on the edge of my understanding, is that
2	return period would mean it would happen only once	you expect to have a storm that would generate
3	every ten years or longer. Every tenth year or more	runoff every year.
4	time, you would expect to have rainfall that would	Q Okay.
5	generate runoff. 04:29PM	A Less than a year, and your site is within 30 04:31PM
6	Q Okay, and in a given area, we call a	meters of the stream, and you would be in this
7	ten-year rain would be	highest risk category here.
8	A Well, you expect to get it every ten years.	Q So okay. Historically every year you are
9	Q And you hear the weathermen talking about this	going to get a rain of a certain size and it's going
10	is a ten-year rain because we got five inches or six 04:29PM	to have runoff within 30 meters of the stream? 04:31PM
11	inches; it's some	A Well, I think there's two separate factors
12	A You don't expect to have that but once every	there. I think you're going to the storm is
13	ten years.	going to return to that frequency.
14	Q Right.	Q Okay.
15	A Correct.	A And the site you are trying to evaluate is 04:32PM
16	Q Underneath ten-year it says, greater than 170	within 30 meters of the stream. I would hope that
17	meters. What does that mean?	before any conclusion is made about this, whoever is
18	A That's in reference to what we talked about	interested would go and look at the Pennsylvania
19	before with the variable source area, distance from	version because I don't understand it that well, but
20	the stream. 04:30PM	that's my broad view of it. 04:32PM
21	Q Okay.	Q Okay. Let's go ahead and let him change tape
22	A It's where they're saying, okay, this	because we have more to go.
23	location, you don't expect to have a rainstorm	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now off the Record.
24	runoff except once every ten years in a ten-year	The time is 4:33 p.m.
25	storm, and your location is greater than 170 meters 04:30PM	(Following a short recess at 4:33 p.m., 04:32PM
	231	233

1	proceedings continued on the Record at 4:40 p.m.)	the best I've got.
2	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.	A Uh-huh.
3	The time is 4:40 p.m.	Q Is there any empirical change in any of these
4	Q Dr. Coale, let's return to return period a	factors that happens that underlies the categories
5	moment. It seems as I look at this, the longer 04:39PM	we see on this phosphorus index? 04:42PM
6	period of time from less than one year to more than	A Not that I know of.
7	ten years seems to be tied to greater distances	Q Okay. Let's look at site source
8	presumably from a stream. Why is that?	characteristics. That's the next thing down, and
9	A I don't know.	like the other things, it's got across the top,
10	Q Now, in the up above those figures, there 04:39PM	none, low, medium, high and very high, and beneath 04:42PM
11	are the headers, none, low, medium, high and very	each of those headers is associated a number, zero,
12	high?	one, two, four and eight.
13	A Uh-huh.	A Uh-huh.
14	Q And it's again a progression from .2 through	Q Do you know the rationale for either the
15	1.0. 04:40PM	descriptor headings or the numbers underneath them? 04:43PM
16	A Correct.	A Well, I think the descriptor headings are the
17	Q Do you first of all, do you know what the	same we talked about before. They're for those
18	none, low, high, medium, high and very high means in	individual elements of risk assessment. Those are
19	the context of return period?	the categorical classification going from none,
20	A I think those are relative levels of risk for 04:40PM	being the lowest on the risk scale, to high being 04:43PM
21	that single evaluation factor.	the highest, and I believe that the numbers in
22	Q Okay. So something that would happen every	parenthesis underneath relate to when you are doing
23	year is riskier to happen than something that	a scoring of a site, that's the numerical value that
24	happens every ten years?	you would use in the tabulation of the score.
25	A That's my interpretation. 04:40PM	Q Okay, and I think we'll get to that in a 04:43PM
	234	236
1	Q Okay, all right. Dr. Coale, do you know of	minute. The first actual quality under that is soil
2	any empirical difference between these events	test P?
3	scientifically that causes this index to organize	A Correct.
4	return period and distance the way it does?	Q Or soil P test in this case. And I guess
5	A No. This is just my the way I'm 04:41PM	they're saying not applicable under none; there 04:44PM
6	interpreting this is that the individuals who	can't be no STP?
7	developed this particular P index felt confident	A I don't think that's what it means.
8	because of the data they had on hand to organize it	Q Oh, okay.
9	this way.	A Basically they're saying they're not going to
10	Q Okay. Let me give you a for instance and see 04:41PM	give any site a none rating. 04:44PM
11	if it's going to apply any of these places because	Q All right, okay. Then low, medium, high and
12	I'm a very scientifically simple guy.	excessive.
13	A Okay.	A Right.
14	Q But I know that, as evidenced by the weather	Q Do you know the numerical values that underlie
15	outside today, below 32 degrees Fahrenheit, water 04:42PM	those descriptors? 04:44PM
16	turns solid.	A Not off the top of my head, but I presume, as
17	A Uh-huh.  Q And above 212 degrees Fahrenheit, it turns to	we mentioned earlier, they are probably the Penn
18		State University agronomic recommendation categories
19 20	a gas. A Uh-huh. 04:42PM	for fertility.  O Okav. If it were Maryland, which is the one 04:44PM
21	Q And because of those things that happen in the	Q Okay. If it were Maryland, which is the one 04:44PM you know because you work with it
22		·
23	real world, we may treat water differently at those different temperatures.	A Right.  Q do you have similar categories, low,
24	A Correct.	medium, high or excessive or something like that for
25	Q And that's a very simple example, but that's 04:42PM	soil test phosphorus? 04:44PM
	235	237

1	A Yes, we do.	Do we know why they have grouped 1 to 15, 16 to 45,
2	Q What are the numbers that underlie your	46 to 75 and over 76?
3	A Well, we have to switch scales.	A No, I don't.
4	Q We'll just try to endure it.	Q Okay. Is there any easy conversion of
5	A Okay. The low would be zero to 25 FIV, 04:45PM	kilograms per hectare to any other unit that a human 04:47PM
6	fertility index value.	being might know?
7	Q Zero to 25. I love this. This is going to be	A It's for general discussion purposes, it
8	fun.	can be equivalent to pounds per acre.
9	A It's pretty simple when you get to the end of	Q It's another broad brush rule of thumb kind of
10	it. 04:45PM	thing? 04:48PM
11	Q Okay.	A Yeah, it's close.
12	A Low is zero to 25. The medium would be 25 to	Q All right. Do you recognize, looking at those
13	50.	numbers, any ice, water, steam empirical
14	Q Okay.	relationship that makes them divide them up the way
15	A The next category is called optimum, and it's 04:45PM	they do? 04:48PM
16	50 to 100, and the next category is called	A No.
17	excessive, and that's greater than 100.	Q Okay. Fertilizer application method, place
18	Q This is tell me what the FIV is again.	with planter deeper than five centimeters
19	A Fertility index value.	incorporated immediately before crop, incorporated
20	Q Okay. Now is when I cash in on your promise 04:45PM	more than three months before crop or surface 04:48PM
21	to make this simple.	applied less than three months before crop and
22	A For the case of phosphorus, that's equivalent	surface applied more than three months before crop.
23	to parts per million Mehlich III P.	A Uh-huh.
24	Q All right, and so in Oklahoma your optimum	Q I'm guessing, as I look at that, we're going
25	would be 100 to 200 pounds per acre? 04:46PM	in increasing risk as we go from left to right? 04:49PM
	238	240
1	MR. McDANIEL: You said Oklahoma, Bob.	A Correct.
2	MR. NANCE: Well, to convert to what we	Q Why is each entry to the right more risky than
3 4	think of in Oklahoma.	the one to the left of it? A For that row?
5	MR. McDANIEL: Okay. Sorry.  Q You got 50 to a hundred. 04:46PM	
6	Q You got 50 to a hundred. 04:46PM A So it would if you use the conversion in	A Well, if none applied, the risk is zero. If
7	Oklahoma, it would be times two, so, yes.	it's placed with a planter deeper than five
8	Q Okay, all right.	centimeters, it means that that phosphorus, that
9	MR. McDANIEL: You're jumping around the	fertilizer has been applied as being injected into
10	country. I'm sorry. I was a state or two behind. 04:46PM	the soil, below the surface of the soil so it's less 04:49PM
11	MR. NANCE: That's quite all right.	prone for interaction with runoff water.
12	Q Now, in our exhibit here, we have two sets of	Q Okay.
13	two lines. One is P fertilizer application rate and	A The next one is supplied incorporated
14	P fertilizer application method.	immediately before the crop is planted, so it's
15	A Uh-huh. 04:47PM	spread on the surface and then immediately plowed 04:49PM
16	Q Then the next two are organic P source	in. These are row crop situations.
17	application rate and organic P source applied	Q Okay.
18	method.	A Next one is incorporated greater than three
19	A Uh-huh.	months before. That means the time it's sitting in
20	Q Let's walk across and figure this out. In the 04:47PM	the field before the crop is growing and utilizing 04:50PM
21	none, there's none applied. We won't deal with	it is longer, so the risk for loss is higher, and
22	that. Low for P fertilizer application rate is 1 to	it's been incorporated or if you surface apply it
23	15 kilograms of phosphorus per hectare.	and not incorporated less than three months, and
24	A Okay.	then the risk the highest risk category would be
25	Q And we can see all the rest of the numbers. 04:47PM	the surface applied greater than three months before 04:50PM
	239	241
	1	

1	crop planted.	A Uh-huh.
2	Q And that's riskiest because it's subject to	Q Let me see if I can understand what happens
3	the elements for over three months?	here. Up above we get an erosion rating.
4	A Correct.	A Uh-huh.
5	Q Before the plants get to it? 04:50PM	Q That's the very top category we looked at; 04:53PM
6	A Correct.	right?
7	Q Okay. The organic source application rate, it	A Correct.
8	increases in risk from left to right I assume, but	Q Below that there's a runoff class rating.
9	the units are smaller than for P fertilizer	A Uh-huh.
10	application rate. Do you see that? 04:50PM	Q Then there's a return period rating. 04:53PM
11	A Yes, I do.	A Right.
12	Q Do you know why that is?	Q And there's an asterisk that says note, that
13	A No, I don't.	waiting for return period is different than that for
14	Q Is there anything that makes organic	erosion and runoff characteristics. Do you know why
15	phosphorus riskier than commercial fertilizer 04:51PM	they had to say that? 04:54PM
16	phosphorus that would justify them using smaller	A I think maybe the numbers in parenthesis for
17	units?	those categories are different. Needs to draw
18	A I don't know what their logic was for using	people's attention to it maybe.
19	smaller units.	Q Okay. To get our erosion rating, just
20	Q Okay. All right, and the application methods 04:51PM	assuming we plugged something in here, if we were in 04:54PM
21	are a little bit different but I think I understand	that first low category, we lost less than 10 metric
22	them. Look at the column called weight.	tons per hectare?
23	A Uh-huh.	A Uh-huh.
24	Q Everything gets a 1.0, except fertilizer	Q Would our erosion class rating be .7?
25	application rate and fertilizer application method. 04:51PM	A The way I understand this, yes. 04:54PM
	242	244
1	Application water is 75 and fortilizan application	O Obey and if any wood alone was very law to
1 2	Application rate is .75 and fertilizer application method is .5. Do you know why those rates are	Q Okay, and if our runoff class was very low to low very low or low, however you define that, it
3	assigned excuse me, those weights are assigned	would also be .7?
4	the way they are?	A I agree.
5	A My presumption is that the developers it's 04:52PM	Q Okay. Is the return period ratings, are 04:55PM
6	by a group of people that developed this, their best	those is that a dial you can use to decide how
7	professional judgment on how important that single	conservative or how risky you want to be in terms of
8	factor is.	your distance allowing placement distance from
9	Q Okay. Is there any established science that	the stream; I mean, is that a policy thing that you
10	justifies those weight numbers that you know of? 04:52PM	can tune depending on how you want to? 04:55PM
11	A I don't know what science they used to get	A That's not the way I understand it. Like I
12	their adjustments.	said before, I'm really working on my edge of
13	Q Okay. Do you have weights like this in	understanding of what return period distance, how
14	Maryland or do you have a weight category in	that's utilized in this model, in this PI.
15	Maryland? 04:52PM	Q Okay, but somehow in return period, you're 04:55PM
16	A A weighted.	going to get a number. It's going to get from none
17	Q Okay. Why do you weigh things in Maryland the	to very high and it's going to run from .2 to 1.0?
18	way you do?	A Correct.
19	A It began based on best professional judgment	Q And you're going to multiply erosion times
20	on which categories you which elements of the 04:53PM	runoff times return period? 04:56PM
21	risk loss assessment tool you think are need to	A Correct.
22	be more strongly emphasized or de-emphasized in	Q And then you're going to multiply that product
23	regard to how they impact the final outcome.	times what's the Sigma mean?
24	Q Okay. Down below all of this there's a line	A That's the summation.
25	that says PI equals; do you see that? 04:53PM	Q Okay. Summation of source characteristic 04:56PM
	243	245

247

249

A Yes.	SIGNATURE PAGE
Q What phosphorus index should the court use for	
the Illinois River watershed?	I, Frank Coale, PhD, do hereby certify
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form, calls	that the foregoing deposition was presented to me by
for a conclusion that's for the court to make. It's 05:02PM	Lisa A. Steinmeyer as a true and correct transcript
outside the scope of his report.	of the proceedings in the above styled and numbered
Q Well, let me ask it this way: Do you have a	cause, and I now sign the same as true and correct.
recommendation that you're going to make to the	WITNESS my hand this day of, 2009.
court about a phosphorus index that should be used	, 2009.
in the Illinois River watershed? 05:03PM	
A Specifically, no, but I think in theory, it	
should be developed by the people who have the most	FRANK COALE, PhD
intimate knowledge of the watershed.	
_	
Q And who are those people? A I don't know the individuals. 05:03PM	
	CLIDCODIDED AND CWODN TO before me this
Q As between the Oklahoma 590 code and the	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me this day of, 2009.
Arkansas phosphorus index, which is more generous in	day of, 2009.
allowing land application of phosphorus, 590 for the	
Illinois River watershed?	
A Right. That I don't know. I haven't made 05:03PM	Notary Public
that comparison.	
Q Are you going to make that comparison before	My Commission Expires:
you testify?	
A I hadn't planned on it.	
MR. NANCE: Okay. I think that's as good a 05:04PM	
250	252
place as any to stop for the day.  VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 5:05 p.m.  (Whereupon, the deposition was recessed at 5:05 p.m.)  05:04PM	C E R T I F I C A T E  STATE OF OKLAHOMA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF TULSA )  I, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, Certified Shorthand Reporter within and for Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that the above named witness was by me first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the case aforesaid, and that I reported in stenograph his deposition; that my stenograph notes were thereafter transcribed and reduced to typewritten form under my supervision, as the same appears herein.  I further certify that the foregoing 252 pages contain a full, true and correct transcript of the deposition taken at such time and place.  I further certify that I am not attorney for or relative to either of said parties, or otherwise interested in the event of said action.  WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL this 19th day of January, 2009.
	LISA A. STEINMEYER, CRR CSR No. 386
251	253

A			
<b>ability</b> 96:16 105:5,15			
<b>able</b> 25:14 32:12 63:16 64:25			
192:18			
aboveground 65:11			
absent 215:15			
<b>absolute</b> 50:21 70:18			
<b>absolutely</b> 17:24 72:15			
104:24,24 149:12 160:21			
162:18			
absorb 130:1			
absorbed 109:12			
<b>abstract</b> 196:22 200:1 210:7			
academic 120:22			
accentuate 179:17			
acceptable 114:9 135:9			
accepted 110:24 167:1			
access 66:10			
accomplish 129:18			
accounts 157:6			
<b>accumulate</b> 65:9 90:4 105:6			
111:11 124:14 130:21			
<b>accumulated</b> 105:12 126:24			
<b>accumulating</b> 105:11 111:16			
158:19 185:6			
accuracy 204:13 205:16,21			
209:11			
accurate 109:20 134:17,18			
154:22 166:8 168:9 186:16			
204:16,19,19,20 205:22			
accurately 122:10			
Achieving 157:22			
acid 56:23,24 57:4			
acknowledgement 156:19			
<b>acre</b> 90:5,7 101:3,5,13 119:19			
120:9 121:7,10 169:13			
206:16,23 221:6 238:25			
240:8 248:15,16 249:3			
acreage 61:25 147:11			
acres 100:22			
across-the-board 166:1			
action 253:21			
actions 164:13			

active 29:7 123:14,17,22

```
124:2,9,16,20
actively 97:14
activity 78:5
acts 126:19
actual 153:19 163:16,21
 237:1
add 71:20 98:22 114:5
 210:11 247:17
added 90:14 119:6,17 129:3
  155:10 172:22,23
adding 90:25 110:21
addition 75:24 91:8
additional 119:5
additions 31:17 113:8,18,21
address 157:19 161:22
adequate 63:9 196:15
adjacent 29:7 73:13 123:16
  124:23 182:4
adjustments 243:12
adopt 193:12
adopted 139:18 220:15,19
 223:6
adoption 12:11 187:10 188:4
 191:9 192:10
adsorbed 118:10 126:4 129:9
  185:23,23
adsorbs 126:4
adsorption 126:25 129:5
 169:5
advances 71:25
advantage 190:2
advisability 49:25 51:12,19
advise 26:12,14,17 27:3
advised 26:21
advises 35:19
advisors 11:13 26:25 56:18
 183:1
afford 186:23
aforesaid 253:11
afternoon 106:24
agencies 26:18
agency 11:13,14 53:1 86:11
aggravating 154:8
aggressively 91:14 97:16
ago 22:11 63:4 91:23 154:22
```

155:3,5,24 211:24 agree 56:19 94:1 153:1 154:20 158:7,25 167:5,19 168:8,24,25 169:7,15 172:2 180:17 181:14 183:16 185:8 206:17 209:11 218:12 245:4 agreed 54:23 56:21 179:15 **agricultural** 6:13,15,24 7:5 8:22 9:16 11:12 16:4 30:14 31:14 53:15 93:14,20 123:12 **agriculture** 6:7 7:15 50:17,18 52:21 134:2,9,20 155:18 193:23 **agronomic** 6:11 33:17 95:12 186:20 202:20 237:18 248:6 248:9,12,24 249:2 agronomically 27:19 33:9 41:3,24 42:15,16 169:10 **agronomics** 33:16,18 agronomy 156:9 **ahead** 16:24 21:1,3 24:18 37:21 84:18 123:1 147:18 194:15 209:5 233:21 air 140:1 al 1:11 algae 88:10 135:8 **algebra** 208:10 alien 21:19 **allowing** 149:20 245:8 250:18 alternative 29:6 181:13.19.25 182:2 183:10 188:2 189:6 alternatively 148:3,4 aluminum 127:1 129:16 168:5 185:24 **amended** 128:22 amendment 130:12 **amount** 20:16 61:15 63:24,25 70:13 113:19 147:11 159:20 168:14,20 246:21 AmSouth 2:23 analyses 163:6 analysis 49:20 214:24 analyzed 19:20 202:3 angle 42:18

```
animal 93:25 102:13,15
                              applied 20:23 21:9 29:21
                                30:24 31:19 39:5 63:9,22,25
  147:5 157:16 193:2
                                66:20 67:12 69:22,24 74:9
animals 97:18,19,22
annual 153:12 157:12
                                74:23 75:3 82:24,25 83:1
answer 11:25 21:1 37:2.11
                                87:10 90:3 94:6 98:12
 51:16 53:3 59:7 61:21,24
                                100:15,17 114:21 115:15
 66:13,13 67:22 68:3,24
                                116:10 121:5 128:5 147:12
 82:12 83:16 89:6 104:19
                                160:16 166:2 167:2,7,16
 115:25 137:6 157:3,23
                                168:2,14,20 169:14 170:8
 158:7,10 159:17 161:8
                                173:20 174:4,9,10 184:3,8
  162:17 165:23 214:19 227:8
                                187:21 196:2 201:15 214:1
 228:5 247:14
                                215:7,10,15,17 216:15
                                217:9,15 239:17,21 240:21
answered 35:2 40:19 73:3
 81:20 83:12,12 145:21
                                240:22 241:6,9,25
answering 48:3
                              apply 10:25 20:11 21:15
anticipate 59:16
                                24:12 25:12,21 26:4,6 31:18
anybody 67:7 130:10
                                33:11,22,24 34:10,22 35:11
anyway 47:2
                                36:14 44:1 54:19 60:6 61:4
apart 16:7 215:8,22
                                61:16 64:15,17,20,25 89:13
apparent 119:12
                                89:16 96:12,16 116:15,15
apparently 205:15 228:25
                                116:22 127:5 150:13 160:17
appears 120:22 148:13
                                170:13 173:25 174:18
  165:20 168:9 172:21 253:15
                                211:18 225:2 235:11 241:22
applicable 224:22 237:5
                              applying 20:13,16 22:12
 249:19
                                24:13 34:3 60:15 89:14
application 10:25 22:6,14
                                111:10 143:11 144:4,20
                                149:25 166:11 174:7 204:8
 24:22 30:10,25 31:1 33:20
 34:5 35:15 63:21 68:20
                                246:14,17
 75:19 77:16 78:15 79:2
                              appreciate 162:1
 87:17,23 93:24 94:10
                              approach 210:14,14 211:13
 100:18 110:5 114:7 119:12
                                211:16
 143:12 144:7 145:14,17
                              approached 8:6,9
                              appropriate 23:19 24:12,15
 147:3 148:12,19,21 149:21
  160:7 166:5 168:13,19,21
                                27:19,21 83:14 104:17,23
                                140:17 159:1,3 170:9,10
 172:4,14,17,19 175:3,6
 176:8,11,18 196:9,9 199:7
                              appropriateness 54:3
 213:9 215:7,16,18 216:16
                              approximate 197:7
                              approximately 19:16 101:12
 217:13,19,25 221:2,5,23
                                107:22 139:1 222:15
 239:13,14,17,22 240:17
 242:7,10,20,25,25 243:1,1
                              approximating 204:3
 250:18
                              approximations 204:17
applications 30:18 63:1,15
                              AR 2:14,20
 63:18 68:24 106:6 114:23
                              area 7:4,5,6 18:5 51:22 71:11
  116:14 142:24 149:4 154:9
                                71:23 81:23 82:8,13,15
                                88:14 125:5,8,10,13 143:16
 227:24
```

144:8,15,16 147:4 149:19 149:20 161:17 167:2 178:7 191:20 192:13,17 219:12,13 219:22,25 229:24 231:6,19 areas 9:21.22 59:4 137:18 138:25 143:11 144:4,19,19 145:8 148:9,13,13 153:5,20 154:10 160:15 161:12 188:3 189:12,20 191:16 **arguing** 82:18 **argumentative** 44:10 160:10 arises 50:5 arithmetic 207:24 Arkansas 47:6 48:21 59:11 107:17 161:10 163:10 184:20,22 220:18 221:19 222:3 250:17 **arrive** 156:11 226:3 **article** 107:4,7,11,15 108:4,6 108:15,21 111:5 133:22 153:2 165:18 170:3,3 177:1 179:21,22 198:18 205:13 222:24 223:2 articles 117:25 133:14 152:17 177:4,6,10 **artificially** 159:20,24 160:12 **aside** 117:13 **asked** 8:20 10:14 35:1 40:19 57:10 73:2,12 81:19 107:14 131:7 145:21,24 160:4 **asking** 9:24 24:17 37:20.23 38:1 48:4 49:21 54:8 61:7 73:20 74:25 81:14 83:10 147:21 160:17 197:18 206:17 207:21,23 209:11 **asleep** 140:3 assess 9:21 26:5 35:3 36:3,16 51:25 78:23,24 114:20 116:21 181:23 assessed 34:19 35:7 42:11 146:13 assesses 221:21 assessment 35:17,19 36:19 37:5,13 39:20 40:1 43:12 44:2 49:17 78:21 116:19,19

117:1 133:8 151:4,5 162:19 179:19 220:10,12 236:18 243:21 247:1 **assessments** 35:24 36:5 assessor 35:19 assign 248:18 **assigned** 230:16 243:3,3 **assignment** 9:25 248:2 assimilate 191:14 associated 116:24 227:21 236:11 **Asst** 2:6 assume 15:5 24:11,14 35:6 90:18 91:7 156:12 202:10 202:13 224:2 242:8 246:14 assumed 24:17 92:12 119:16 122:5 assumes 112:12 146:16 assuming 42:5 80:23 115:5 117:4 120:8 130:23 191:15 244:20 **assumption** 19:24 45:15 112:15 115:2 121:5,19 137:17 138:18 203:9,12 205:3 assumptions 122:17 asterisk 244:12 attached 118:11 **attempt** 213:25 attempting 217:6 attended 11:18,24 212:21 attendees 12:3 **attention** 79:13 86:25 144:17 244:18 attenuated 125:2 **attorney** 1:5 2:3,6,9,13,16,19 2:22 253:19 attributed 93:12 audiences 12:2 **Austin** 8:15,17,19 **author** 92:22,24 158:2 **authors** 145:5 146:18,21,22 146:24 148:24 150:10 154:18 169:16 170:23 194:22 203:21 228:25

**authors's** 152:20 **author's** 107:20 145:2 available 16:5 18:18 19:23 26:1,2,7 28:25 44:13 55:4 68:11 71:17.18.18 72:2 88:6 96:19,20 129:10 149:21 211:22 249:17 **avenues** 183:14 average 104:22 119:19 179:1 206:15 averaged 103:18 104:16 avoid 144:19 145:14 aware 22:13 31:21 32:4 58:20 59:22 60:11 62:6 64:11 84:1 86:13,18 92:3 102:22 120:19 140:15 142:12 161:14,15 163:24 164:3,9 164:13,15 184:25 193:25 **a.m** 4:2,5 44:23,25 45:1,3 84:21,23,24 85:1

## B

**B** 16:2 52:5 208:2 209:8 back 13:6 22:21 33:14 45:2 49:2 52:19 67:21 72:9 84:25 94:14 106:22 114:25 117:10 122:17 123:7 126:7 126:12 139:17 140:25 141:1 151:8 152:13 165:14 166:8 167:3,3 170:12 176:23 190:13,13,16,18,20,25 191:1.5 192:15 195:4.6 199:12 200:23 206:14 208:4 211:13 220:11,13 226:20 227:2,3 232:9 234:2 **backed** 150:12 **background** 8:24 87:4 88:25 89:7,8 **backing** 229:10 backwards 206:24 **bad** 85:20 **balance** 147:17,19,25 148:2 148:25 157:22 158:4,24 163:25 173:13 180:22 181:5 181:18 186:18 188:19

balancing 187:1 **baled** 102:9 **ballpark** 19:18,25 barrier 128:13,17 129:2,8 130:14 barriers 128:21 131:8 **based** 18:10,25 21:12 22:12 23:4,15 25:24 28:18,24 30:13 44:7 49:20 57:13 63:2,22 71:9 94:11 99:7 100:15 104:13 111:3 121:12 122:18 142:17 151:17 154:10 155:1,4,12,14 156:10,14 177:23 200:25 201:1 207:21,23 226:15 228:14,17 229:7 243:19 246:13,20 baseline 103:20,22 173:16 174:15,21 175:7,8,10,14,19 176:5 **basically** 9:1 12:8 49:19,23 50:5 52:18 53:5 56:12 96:21 102:12 108:8 113:13 127:4 139:18 191:3 213:6 214:19 237:9 **basin** 124:12 **basis** 34:20 153:11,17 170:15 181:2 190:7 197:20 204:9 221:9 227:5 batches 58:15 **Bates** 57:22 **Bay** 7:4,7 bear 41:22 50:20 55:19 121:23 **beating** 83:13 becoming 83:13 **bedrock** 132:19 **beef** 55:7 62:16 182:15 **began** 4:1 174:6 243:19 **beginning** 121:12 151:20 185:1 218:2 begins 175:22 180:7 202:19 203:9

behalf 1:16 59:21 60:9,18

61:10 85:3 214:3

**behave** 15:21 **belief** 211:23 believe 7:25 8:10 9:5 10:9 14:15 21:22 29:25 30:3 47:17 48:16 50:10 58:2.5 71:12 75:21 86:8,17 88:22 90:21 95:19 96:3 99:9 111:5 116:9 134:18 145:11 154:4 155:25 164:4 165:12 167:1 181:3 196:21 199:3 207:25 221:4,7,7 222:11 226:13 228:17,18 236:21 **boil** 19:24 **believed** 71:16 **beneath** 236:10 benefit 19:8 49:25 **Benton** 161:11 **Bermuda** 108:9 109:12 172:7 173:1,4,5 174:2,13 best 26:3,6,13 27:2 29:14 33:9 41:3 52:24 97:20 99:23 107:20 186:2 187:2 220:2 236:1 243:6,19 better 33:22 34:12.14.23 35:15 36:13,25 41:24 43:2 46:11 97:24 99:22 101:25 133:12 151:12 152:3 185:12 185:15 215:2 216:8 beyond 81:23 82:8,13 191:20 218:1 big 76:25 77:14 100:21 150:1 194:13 232:3 **bigger** 194:8 225:10,12 **billion** 200:16 201:23 207:9 207:16,20 208:9,14 209:22 **Billy** 48:12 **biomass** 109:25 114:8 **bird** 71:19,19 **birds** 79:16 brings 8:5 **bit** 94:16 116:8 155:1 167:4 223:8 242:21 **blanket** 34:6 35:4 blend 70:24 180:12,14 **blended** 71:1 72:1 **block** 131:11 140:2 **blocking** 131:5,12

**blunder** 218:10 **BMP** 186:1 **BMPs** 185:17 188:5 191:10 **board** 119:23 **Bob** 4:7,20 11:19 41:16 82:18 152:5 160:4 239:1 **bodies** 6:22 9:18 85:25 93:12 body 9:20 73:13 74:7,10 78:6 78:11,17 81:22 85:23 88:17 112:13,14 123:16,20,23,24 125:18 196:7,8 **bolded** 167:7 **Boston** 2:16 **bother** 57:23 140:13 **bottom** 13:11 17:2 39:11 62:25 68:25 89:5 97:1 104:6 105:1 114:14 132:3 186:24 192:6 193:12 196:25 198:25 205:25 213:18,23 220:17 229:6 246:24,25 **bounced** 38:25 box 2:23 25:8 198:25 **bov** 246:20 **bracket** 169:12 **brain** 154:21 **branch** 214:6 Bray 202:20,23 break 18:18 19:1 38:7 41:23 44:20 67:17 106:14,16 123:2 152:7,8 188:7 194:15 breaking 145:22 **breakpoint** 226:11 248:19 breakpoints 227:20 **breaks** 228:2,3 **briefly** 93:11 **bring** 13:21 114:3 120:12 **bringing** 158:16 **Britain** 157:14 **broad** 37:20 38:22 39:9 199:6 199:9,10,14 200:13 201:23 202:1,7 204:11,13 207:14 207:18 208:16 209:15,25 210:6,13,17,23 211:13,24

212:2,7 218:19,21 233:20 240:9 broader 202:1 **broadly** 54:14,16 249:19 **broiler** 108:24 109:16 111:9 113:8 114:23 **broke** 45:4 106:25 broker 183:13,14,18 189:11 **brokers** 183:20 **brought** 13:20,23 31:12 158:5 160:6 189:15 **brush** 199:9,10,14 200:13 201:24,25 202:1,7 207:14 207:18 208:16 209:15,25 210:6,13,18,23 211:13,25 212:3,7 218:19,21 240:9 **budget** 172:3 **buildup** 89:10 **built** 39:21 108:23 **bulk** 132:18 **bunch** 95:2 **burden** 42:8 business 26:24 29:13 33:1 187:4 202:11 228:7 229:20 buy 46:4,7,9 **buyers** 192:11 **bytes** 38:7  $\mathbf{C}$ 

**C** 1:6 2:1,19 4:14 68:25 69:5 69:10 117:18 208:7,24 209:6 211:3 253:1.1 calcium 127:1 129:16 168:5 calculated 38:21 137:15 226:25 227:9 **calculation** 153:16 209:3 **calculations** 169:18 201:14 211:10 calibration 90:3 call 8:10 12:16 83:11,16 93:6 106:15 164:21 199:8 214:8 231:6 **called** 26:23 166:17 223:22 238:15,16 242:22 **calls** 49:12 50:3 51:14,20

250:4 cause 1:17 112:10 252:7 **chicken** 70:6 83:4,4 **chickens** 84:12 191:4 **Cal-Maine** 2:22 4:20 caused 6:24 30:10 capacities 169:5 **circumstance** 32:11 41:18 **causes** 235:3 capacity 1:5,7 55:6 122:15,22 causing 46:21 87:16 182:6 129:6 150:14 191:14 **caution** 204:7 **circumstances** 44:4 216:1 **caption** 7:17,22 cautious 24:20 citations 90:22 **ceiling** 139:23 cite 90:7 113:1 capturing 132:5 care 68:10,13,16 85:19 **center** 202:5 cited 108:16 115:6 152:17 153:13 **centimeters** 240:18 241:8 177:4,6 195:14 career 7:12 **central** 190:11 cites 14:22 94:17 110:5 careful 39:20 certain 11:25 27:1 88:3,4 119:10 167:17 168:6 carefully 193:5 146:2 153:2,5 156:17 citing 117:24 218:17 220:9,9 229:24 City 1:18 2:7 **Cargill** 2:9 4:17,18 **carries** 117:21 233:9 clarify 56:14 57:6 **carrying** 74:7 76:22 125:20 **certainly** 111:2 140:13 **class** 224:10,16 226:18,23 case 5:14,21 7:14,16,19,22 certainty 73:24 230:2 244:8,24 245:1 Certificate 3:7 classes 11:2,4,5,7,15,18,24 8:5,7 9:2 10:8 11:20,21 13:18 29:5 33:21 39:23 certified 1:20,21 253:6 12:1 40:10,10 42:6 48:2 52:21 **certify** 252:3 253:8,16,19 **classification** 230:2 236:19 66:3 68:4 112:10,11 113:16 cessation 114:6 classroom 11:5 122:2 145:10 150:5 153:25 cetera 57:14 125:14 185:24 clay 48:13 49:10 129:24 162:15 163:25 178:13 179:3 220:3 221:24.24 228:13 130:3.8 132:16 180:9 181:15 237:4 238:22 **challenges** 179:23 185:5 **clavs** 126:4 253:11 187:24 188:9 **clean** 193:14 cases 13:6 20:20,20 34:16 **change** 44:21 45:4 84:18 clear 7:21 41:16 50:15 124:11 46:20 71:13,14 123:2 125:14 129:4 130:19 **Clearly** 187:24 137:3,5 151:9 233:21 236:3 cash 238:20 **clients** 183:15 **catch** 69:4 **changed** 220:15 **climb** 110:10 catching 132:7 **changes** 105:4 130:8 **close** 55:18 180:22 232:21,22 **categorical** 44:5 236:19 changing 143:23 240:11 **categorically** 14:23 28:16 **channel** 139:2 148:13 **closely** 180:16 40:11,20 characteristic 245:25 Coale 1:15 3:4 4:4,24 5:5,7 13:11,24 14:13 16:17 19:14 categories 38:23 39:1,9 64:14 characteristics 221:24 224:4 156:4 224:18 227:25 228:10 236:8 244:14 246:5,6 247:1 25:10 32:11 41:2 45:4 228:13,14 230:15 236:4 **characterize** 37:21 221:22 49:24 51:8 53:7 54:17 56:9 237:18,23 243:20 244:17 characterized 93:22 60:1,12 61:1,14 65:7 70:8 category 38:25 64:17,20 chart 173:15 207:22 249:3 72:9 85:2 86:10 87:16 **cheap** 193:13 224:21 227:6,12,14 230:5 88:19 92:15,16 99:17 **cheaper** 32:21 55:20 101:15 106:24 107:10 230:18 233:7 238:15,16 241:24 243:14 244:5,21 chemical 96:5 126:20 128:21 116:23 117:12 123:9 132:4 248:25 128:24 129:2,8,12 133:11 137:9 142:14 145:15 **chemically** 83:22 118:10 **cattle** 55:7 69:2,18,25 70:5 147:19 152:15 155:21 83:1,3 98:3,7,18 99:5,9 126:4 156:18 164:21 165:13,17 chemistry 67:2,4 102:10 150:5 195:6 210:17 218:19 234:4 **causative** 134:3,21 Chesapeake 7:4,6 235:1 252:3,12 254:1

Coblentz 107:18 108:6 code 220:22 250:16 **coefficient** 122:18 195:18 196:10 197:1,19 198:8 199:25 200:10 201:4.24 202:2,7 203:16 204:1,4 205:7 207:24 209:16 217:6 **coefficients** 197:25 200:5 203:10,13 204:2 205:4 coined 219:14 colleague 14:3 colleagues 170:16 collect 122:7 collecting 136:9 **collection** 178:25 201:1 collective 229:8 College 2:20 colon 157:12 **column** 100:6,7 101:9 109:9 109:23 111:7 112:24 114:14 133:20 137:10 142:15 153:3 172:21 173:12 174:2.12 176:21 185:2 192:6.25 202:15 224:21 226:19 242:22 **columns** 173:1,8 combination 176:16 combined 118:3 come 8:20 24:1 27:1,9 28:11 32:1 58:3,7 59:1 66:20 68:19,23 80:12 89:14 90:19 106:9,11 133:13 139:22 151:13 152:2 156:6 195:17 195:17 198:22 203:25 208:11 comes 64:13 67:12,12,23 68:16,22 70:15 72:12 81:2 91:2,7 92:9 95:25 143:1 158:23 170:12 176:8 181:9 190:3 226:5 **comfortable** 14:6,9,10 72:17 80:23,25 81:1,6 coming 10:11 98:24 100:1 220:13 comment 135:1 169:23

**comments** 23:14 132:12 **commercial** 30:24 31:4,22 32:3 33:5,5 45:7,19,22 55:13 57:9 87:9 89:19 98:5 154:12 242:15 246:15.18.21 Commission 252:23 **common** 22:16 49:14 71:12 71:12 75:13 137:23 139:15 155:2 182:2 214:8 232:24 commonly 22:20 179:7 commonplace 32:10 communicated 48:1 community 11:11 companies 50:11,13,20 53:2 180:11 comparable 140:15 **compare** 106:4 136:16,20 137:4 225:23 **compared** 111:12,22 136:22 168:3 **comparison** 103:9 250:21,22 **comparisons** 103:2 137:14 complaint 169:19 complete 95:10 102:24 completely 38:2 completeness 147:16 194:21 **complex** 215:12 **complexity** 203:15 205:6,19 complicated 157:14 **complicating** 111:9 215:6 **component** 18:19 110:2 116:18 200:8,11 220:16 components 116:20,21 200:9 composition 132:15 compositions 130:13 compounding 216:14 compounds 129:16,16,17 168:5 **concave** 124:12 **concentrated** 70:14 93:21 157:16 **concentration** 76:3 91:15 95:1 100:24 103:2,17 105:4 105:19 111:20 112:1,3,8 114:17 127:19 148:7 196:1

202:8 215:15,22 **concentrations** 93:13 94:17 95:16 96:19 99:21 103:1 105:25 138:19 214:2 **concept** 223:10 concepts 148:5 **concern** 46:22 65:5 85:9,12 85:14 86:4,6 123:13 163:3,4 165:21,24 170:6 176:25 178:4 concerned 86:1 139:5 153:9 162:2 **concerns** 6:13,15 181:17 concerted 185:3 conclude 60:20 177:25 concluded 213:24 conclusion 50:4 51:15,21 84:10 185:2 187:23 214:12 233:17 250:5 **conclusions** 104:25 108:15 180:3 202:15 203:8 concurrence 106:1 **conditions** 34:5 124:25 125:14 126:9 170:9 197:9 203:14 205:5 conducted 86:19 179:14 conducting 49:20 conductivity 78:15 conference 49:11 confident 235:7 confined 147:5 193:1 conflicting 187:9 conforms 139:15 140:24 **confused** 21:5 56:12,15 confusing 218:14 223:17 230:12 confusion 134:11 connected 112:13 123:23 125:17 consensus 214:4,11 consequences 85:21 consequently 21:9 Conservation 171:4 conservative 245:7 **consider** 51:18 53:7,10 54:3

89:7 249:8,11 considerably 175:8 consideration 215:12 **considered** 13:5 57:25 58:18 89:3 97:6 106:1 109:19 163:14 169:1 214:17 248:11 considers 161:16 consistent 105:19 108:16 110:6 consistently 101:18 constant 119:20 120:8 121:17 166:11 constantly 187:1 constituents 18:2,19 19:1 constructed 129:2 consultants 11:13 **consumption** 154:6 171:9 **contact** 129:25 contacted 10:9 contain 64:1 123:13 253:17 **contained** 57:9 113:25 contains 56:24 contaminant 91:15 content 78:9 129:24 130:3 148:7 **contents** 142:18 context 113:24 115:16 185:13 188:10,25 219:12 234:19 **continue** 20:25 91:1 126:7 **continued** 44:25 84:23 106:21 108:11 109:4,4 110:4 111:24 114:7 143:11 144:7 145:16 152:12 195:3 234:1 continues 119:6 continuing 129:10 **continuous** 123:22 230:3 **continuum** 226:14 227:23 228:16 contrary 14:20 33:2 **contribute** 155:17 162:14,22 contributing 40:1 **contribution** 16:7 214:25 **control** 118:4 181:8,8,10 193:10

controlled 215:8 **controlling** 142:1 148:11 215:1 217:14 convenience 152:7,8 **conversation** 49:23 52:13 178:8 188:13,23 212:18,20 **conversations** 48:12,13 49:13 49:19 converse 189:23 conversion 195:24,24 198:22 202:9 204:9 211:18,19,21 213:8 239:6 240:4 248:17 convert 65:10 101:4 239:2 conveyance 78:14 convinced 162:18 **copies** 92:17 copy 13:17,20,21 108:5 165:4 196:16 **corn** 72:1 190:21,23 191:4,5 **corner** 167:6 198:25 **correct** 5:15 15:14,15 17:23 17:24 22:4 36:17 38:13 39:3 44:18 45:21 48:22 50:24 54:22 55:1,2,8 60:24 62:14 63:5,6 68:7,8,12 69:20,23 74:24 75:14,16 89:18 92:25 93:1 94:2.3.13 96:1 98:1 99:1 101:14,22 102:1 104:12,15 105:22 112:22 117:2 119:3 135:16 141:19 142:6,6 143:8 144:21,25 145:19 147:6 148:15 149:11 150:2 153:22 154:7,13 156:2,8 164:25 166:23 168:7 172:16,24 173:3,6,23 174:1,17,23 176:3,6 177:3 179:10 180:25 186:6 189:10 191:8 191:12 200:17 201:19 207:1 207:3,4 208:13 213:22 221:7,8 224:12,20 225:17 225:19,22 230:22 231:15 234:16 235:24 237:3 241:1 242:4,6 244:7 245:18,21 247:23 248:3,5,20,22 252:5

252:7 253:17 **CORRECTION** 254:3 **CORRECTIONS** 254:1 **correctly** 15:2 17:9,18 20:2 50:22 58:24 69:17 95:18 103:5,25 105:7 126:16 131:22 134:5 138:1 149:22 157:17,24 173:20 174:24 185:18 198:23 201:20 225:14 232:2 correctness 196:12 correlated 117:8 **correlation** 114:17 115:4,7,7 115:12 117:6 **cost** 32:18 33:7 41:2,6,9,22 42:13 50:20 52:25 55:4,9,11 55:13,16,19 187:3 **costing** 186:25 costly 186:13 193:12 costs 50:19 187:8 **cough** 133:17 counsel 4:5 219:21,23 **count** 13:16 **counted** 57:15 **counter** 40:13 counties 161:11 209:6 **country** 21:14 64:12 90:23 223:4 239:10 County 1:18 253:4,7 **couple** 49:11 111:13 113:4 119:21 166:16 210:8 228:14 course 9:22,23 19:18 55:5 130:19 166:22 219:15 courses 5:13 **court** 1:1 5:6 41:11,19 42:18 54:9 67:18,20 164:5,16 250:2,5,9 covered 12:9 Cox 113:1 **co-authors** 169:25 204:21 **create** 32:6 63:15 created 153:6 creates 96:4 creek 137:24 201:4 creeks 77:21

criteria 184:1 **critical** 133:25 143:1 219:12 219:13,22,24 critically 178:1 **criticism** 177:10.20 **crop** 6:19,20 15:6,10 19:6 21:16 22:13,15 23:24 32:24 33:7,19 43:8,10 63:17 64:2 65:2,15,16 90:4 95:17 101:17 102:4 105:20 110:25 118:4 119:6 154:11 155:2,8 156:5 167:16 168:3 180:17 240:19,20,21,22 241:14,16 241:20 242:1 **cropping** 103:4 104:11 **crops** 20:4 88:6 91:1 94:11 96:6,22 97:2,8,14 98:14 101:19 103:10,10 109:25 156:17 168:2 **crosses** 200:20 CRR 253:24 **crunched** 204:21 **crystal** 124:10 **CSR** 253:24 **cubic** 229:23 cursory 99:7 **curve** 228:2 cut 151:23 213:17 **cutting** 148:18 **cycle** 135:7 **C-O-B-L-E-N-T-Z** 107:22 D

**D** 3:1 dairy 145:11 150:13 dam 130:24 **Daniel** 167:23 Darned 95:7 data 19:24 30:6,8 75:22 76:24 77:8 79:20,22 80:1,5 86:14 88:17 90:22 115:10 120:1 121:2,9,11 160:15,19 161:7 196:2 197:2,4,6,24 198:9,15 201:1,2,3,13 204:8 204:21,24 209:1 211:19

213:10 228:2,10 230:23 235:8 dataset 122:1,3,4,6,7,10,11 122:19,20 139:14,17,18 140:25 163:20 datasets 117:7,7 121:21 195:20 data-point-by-data-point 204:9 date 178:18 222:14 day 1:17 117:15 187:5 251:1 252:8,18 253:22 deal 183:17,17 215:19 217:18 217:25 239:21 dealer 33:6 dealing 11:11 19:21 20:5,21 21:6 **dealt** 7:23 52:15,16 53:17 decades 22:11 95:14 105:25 **December** 7:20 8:8 10:6,7 **decide** 29:10 54:9 218:24 245:6 **decided** 52:22 229:1 **deciding** 52:6 197:20 **decision** 18:24 25:18 26:10 33:1,14 53:5 187:5 193:22 193:25 229:10 decisions 18:9,16 23:2,4 26:13 28:17,21 44:6 51:9 180:7 218:23,25 declaration 13:3,17,25 14:5 14:11,14,16 **decline** 89:10 90:24 91:5 105:14 108:11,13,18,24 118:5 119:9,13,15,16,20,23 121:15,18 122:5,18 174:6 declined 109:3 119:5 121:6 **declining** 120:9 175:23 decomposition 16:6 decrease 72:5 90:15 103:11 148:14,22 decreased 151:10 decreasing 186:24 deem 135:8 deemed 96:10,11

deep 65:9 98:16 **deeper** 111:12,23 112:2 198:13 240:18 241:7 deeply 65:11 66:7 defecate 98:18 defendant 133:5 **defendants** 1:12 4:15,21 7:13 7:22 8:2 11:19,21 41:12,19 42:5,6,19 47:13 60:10,18 61:11 67:7 70:24 74:14 76:10,14 81:17 82:16 84:12 85:3,4 86:19,24 88:16 120:17 124:5 130:7 160:7 163:25 164:10 **defense** 59:21 62:2 102:20 **defensible** 84:10,16 119:11 deficiency 14:25 15:8,9,25,25 deficient 191:16 define 86:20 159:25 160:1 245:2 **defined** 100:10 definitely 88:14 definition 85:16 definitive 104:9 **defrav** 187:7 degrades 118:14 **degree** 73:23 degrees 132:2 235:15,18 **DeLaune** 222:11 deliberate 130:11 deliberately 129:13 delineation 139:15 delivery 73:18 201:4 **Delmarva** 6:7,16,24 7:1,24 8:2 71:11 **demand** 20:7 61:8,17 168:3 194:2 demonstrate 43:11,12 122:19 213:25 **dense** 201:12 **density** 132:18 **Department** 50:17,18 52:21 193:23 **depend** 127:13 **dependent** 34:4 91:5

**depending** 34:7 67:2 108:25 245:10 **depends** 20:17 31:12 46:23 65:15 98:9 126:9 127:13,16 127:19.25 129:17 168:12.18 188:13,22 216:6 229:21 **deposited** 69:1 99:11 **deposition** 1:15 4:1,4 5:14,16 14:3 24:18 25:5 108:3 251:4 252:4 253:12,18 254:1 deposits 98:7 190:11,15 **depth** 66:2,10,16,17,23 98:16 98:16 111:25 114:19 132:18 depths 65:23 66:12 **derived** 120:21 221:15 **describe** 12:20 131:14 described 126:21 130:4,12,14 describing 211:9 description 119:1 descriptive 230:4,5 **descriptor** 236:15,16 descriptors 237:15 **designated** 47:25 48:1 **designation** 218:13 226:7 designations 226:4 designed 179:14,17 219:5,8 **desire** 154:11 desk 140:7 **despite** 110:2 187:6 destination 45:13 detailed 99:8 **details** 50:15 184:17 **determination** 30:23 218:4 determine 61:12 121:18 132:20 146:13 156:15 determined 60:12,17 61:1,11 61:14 62:2 90:3 120:5 134:4 191:16 determining 81:21 **detour** 86:10 develop 111:24 122:1,4,6,16 122:18 179:8 185:17 197:19 197:25 217:6 **developed** 12:16 66:24

119:10 120:11 121:2 122:8 151:17,21 195:15 196:14 223:7 235:7 243:6 250:12 developer 197:14 developers 243:5 **developing** 9:3 151:22 157:19 195:16 197:17 204:11,13 205:11 **development** 10:24 12:18 181:12 191:17 devising 53:25 de-emphasized 243:22 diagram 135:24 155:22 177:13 diagrams 166:16 dial 245:6 Dicks 48:14 49:18,19 60:19 Dickson 2:13 diet 71:19.25 difference 34:17,18 35:12,25 128:22 217:4 226:15 235:2 differences 130:3 179:18 196:5 different 12:17 15:21 26:8 31:14 32:13,19,23 36:23 38:12 39:8,21 42:18 52:3 64:14 88:7 99:10 100:6,7 108:12,13,17,18 109:1 118:18 120:6 124:24 125:16 126:8,23 127:3 129:4,21 130:13 134:12 152:6 169:1 171:11 188:17 191:25 192:17 196:11 212:11 223:6 223:8,9,9 227:24 228:15 230:1 232:20 235:23 242:21 244:13,17 246:5,25 differently 24:10 235:22 **difficult** 15:20 37:10 181:7 185:7 187:16 204:18 difficulties 132:4 direct 3:5 5:3 176:14 **direction** 152:6 157:6 directions 83:24 dirt 131:18 disagree 90:13,16,17,18,20

205:16 disagreement 205:1 discharge 87:13 discuss 47:24 164:23 discussed 88:15.17 101:2 109:19 130:9 148:5 178:21 178:22 discussing 148:1 discussion 7:13 9:23 24:11 62:10 101:16 123:5 194:22 240:7 dismissed 87:1 disperse 125:5 dispute 30:9 dissolution 118:3 dissolved 118:16 125:20 126:3,18,22 128:6 197:7 202:25 203:17 205:8,14 215:5,15,18 216:2,18,19 217:1 distance 140:17 142:1 150:18 224:11 230:10 231:19 235:4 245:8,8,13 249:13 **distances** 224:15 234:7 distinctions 228:12 distinguishable 228:9 **distributed** 71:1 228:19,24 229:11 distributing 183:14 **distribution** 157:15 158:13 DISTRICT 1:1.2 **disturb** 161:1,3 disturbed 160:14,20 161:4,7 161:9 **disturbingly** 160:6,11 divide 206:24 228:20 240:14 **divided** 118:9 **Doctor** 36:4 165:9 183:4 202:21 215:3 **document** 13:7 46:19 115:22 144:23 170:21 227:3 documented 159:4,6,9 160:5 181:16 documents 13:5 doing 37:14,16,17,20,22

264

49:22 68:9 111:18 145:6 236:22 dominant 39:25 **double** 169:12 downhill 81:6 downward 67:1 dozen 196:25 **Dr** 4:4 5:5 13:24 14:13,21 16:17 19:14 25:10 30:9 32:11 41:2 45:4 48:13,19,25 49:6,10,18,19,24 51:8 53:7 54:17 56:9,19 57:17 58:21 58:21,23,24 59:6 60:1,12,19 61:1,14 65:7 70:8 72:9 85:2 86:10,15 87:16 88:19 89:22 90:2,9 92:8,10,15 93:4 94:18 99:17 101:15 106:24 107:25 116:23 117:12 119:10 120:22 123:9 132:4 132:4,11,11 137:9 142:14 145:15 147:19 152:15,23 155:21 156:18 160:19,25 164:21,23 165:2,6,13,17,18 165:21,25 166:24 167:22,23 169:19,20,23,24 170:7,16 171:13 176:25 177:1,12,13 177:17,24 178:9,16 179:6 179:22 195:6,10,12,14,15 195:15 196:1,10,13,19,20 196:22 197:12 198:19,20 199:3 206:3,12,13 207:22 210:17 211:2 212:18,21,23 212:25,25 213:6,12,15,23 213:24,24 214:4,19 218:19 234:4 235:1 drain 124:12 drainage 87:5 129:11 dramatic 149:16 153:19 **dramatically** 110:20 113:15 176:22 draw 65:12,25 244:17 **DREW** 1:4 drive 31:4,23 **drop** 133:17 175:22 185:10 **Dropping** 147:14

**DRP** 214:25 215:1,19 **due** 30:17 39:17 131:12 168:3 221:21 **duly** 1:20 4:25 253:9 **dynamic** 118:14 **D-I-C-K-S** 48:15 **D.C** 8:15

 $\mathbf{E}$ **E** 2:1,1 3:1,3,3 123:9 213:14 253:1.1 earlier 12:21 75:21 141:1,8 180:24 189:15 193:20 201:16 206:3 237:17 earth 80:15 162:10 easier 39:4 150:4 easily 249:9,11,15 east 2:13 17:2 **eastern** 71:10 easy 240:4 eat 98:18 ecological 123:13 ecologists 135:8 economic 96:4 143:1 188:14 economics 32:16,18 53:8,10 economists 53:15 ecosystem 87:12 188:21 edge 125:3,4 132:5,8 178:25 200:18 201:3,3,21 202:5 233:1 245:12 EDMONDSON 1:4 education 11:4,7,9 150:10,11 183:19 **effect** 129:21 135:5 **effective** 18:11 19:11,19 23:11,16 25:11,16,18,20,25 26:2,7 27:7 28:6,19,22,24 29:18 44:8,12,14 50:2 52:1 54:6 55:4,9,16 182:8,13,21 186:18 202:24 **effectively** 27:17 28:9,12 32:14 43:20 95:15 182:10 182:12,16 183:12

**effectiveness** 25:17 132:2

**efficiency** 25:17 186:20

**efficient** 18:11 19:3,9,13,19 23:7,10,16,22 25:11,16,24 26:1,6 27:6,13 28:6,18,21 28:24 29:18 32:21 33:8 42:12 44:8.12.14 50:2 52:1 52:2 54:6 182:7,21 186:18 **efficiently** 19:5 23:8 27:17 29:12 32:14 43:19 182:10 182:12 **effort** 185:3 efforts 55:22 eight 62:23 236:12 either 13:13 93:23 98:4 100:18 104:11 129:1 137:4 160:16 161:4 178:11 184:21 184:21 190:1 228:14 236:14 246:1,14,17,21 253:20 elastic 89:10 **element** 56:11 249:15 **elemental** 56:10,14 elements 188:23 236:18 242:3 243:20 **elevate** 87:18 106:4 **elevated** 30:10,17 31:1 37:3 75:18 76:4,6,7,10,21 77:17 77:19 79:1,23 80:2,6,10 85:18 91:3 93:13 102:18 105:15 106:10 124:1 162:13 163:3,4 175:7,8 176:12 **elevation** 104:8 119:17 137:3 137:5 elevations 128:25 **eleven** 155:9 **Elrod** 2:12 4:16,16 25:4,9 37:17 62:8 67:15 116:6 139:20 140:3,8 emphasized 243:22 emphasizing 112:18 **empirical** 226:15 235:2 236:3 240:13 empirically 228:9 **employ** 186:4 **employed** 5:8 31:23 employee 7:13

employees 7:23

employing 195:23 **enacted** 63:13 64:7,22,23 encountered 129:1 encourage 52:22 encouraged 192:9 **ended** 84:8 endorse 28:5 ends 46:16 78:10 **endure** 238:4 engagement 10:1 **Engel** 165:19,25 166:24 169:19 170:7 176:25 **Engel's** 164:24 165:2,6,22 169:24 177:13,24 enhance 19:6 113:8 192:12 192:20 enhances 55:5 enrich 98:8 **enriched** 7:7 71:4 85:15 93:23 97:3,9 99:6 enrichment 72:7 143:14,17 144:10 145:18 146:15,19 enrollment 187:10 **entered** 202:4 entering 98:11 **entire** 28:1,2 142:18 entitled 85:9 179:23 218:3 entity 17:25 18:23 entries 57:15 224:7,8 entry 241:2 **environment** 1:6 34:19 43:14 86:22 environmental 5:13 34:2 35:15 36:13,16 37:5 46:22 65:5 81:25 85:21 86:19,20 171:11 186:7,21 189:2 229:12 environmentally 27:21 33:22 34:12,13,23 36:20 43:2 46:11 86:2 203:1 **EPA** 133:24 134:12,12,15 **equal** 34:14,22 35:21,22,23 35:24 119:16 228:20,21 equally 202:23 228:19,24 equals 199:11,14,22 200:15

201:23 207:9,15 210:22 243:25 **equate** 14:23 **equation** 198:13,24 199:3,7 207:8,12 209:15,18,25 210:3,10,15,20,24 211:9,10 211:14,21 212:6 213:8 equivalent 238:22 240:8 **erosion** 39:15,17,23 40:3,22 75:10 131:19 222:1 224:10 224:16,17,18 225:13 226:5 228:25 229:4,5,16,17 244:3 244:14,19,24 245:19 **errors** 213:7 **especially** 66:6,23 110:4 essential 14:24 essentially 220:22 **established** 132:7 243:9 **estimate** 62:3 166:1 estimates 61:25 estimation 60:19,20,22,24 et 1:11 57:14 125:14 185:24 220:3 221:23.24 228:13 **Europe** 153:5,13 **eutrophication** 93:11 112:10 112:14 133:25 134:22 135:2 135:5.7 evaluate 38:22 221:25 233:15 evaluated 162:25 evaluating 202:24 evaluation 28:8 104:8 118:23 220:1,8,8,19,21 234:21 event 77:9,15 82:22 230:23 230:24 232:21 253:21 events 178:24 235:2 eventually 127:24 Evers 109:14 everybody 187:21 214:9 evidenced 235:14 exact 178:17 exactly 19:20 140:8 163:12 189:14 198:1 **examination** 3:5 5:3 147:17 147:24 194:23 **example** 15:20,23 17:5,7

26:20 39:12 72:1 124:9,11 129:23 141:2 142:9 171:10 184:3 189:16 190:3 193:20 194:6,6 222:17 235:25 247:5 **exception** 31:9 195:9,12 209:2 211:17 excerpting 144:23 excess 90:4,6 110:24 153:14 153:17 157:12 158:12 159:10 excesses 157:22 excessive 93:24 95:15 156:4 237:12,24 238:17 exchanging 120:7 **excreted** 167:15 excuse 20:17 65:13 71:7,18 88:4 104:8 118:2 140:11 143:20 160:3 169:3 173:23 213:21 243:3 246:8 exercise 120:22 exhibit 13:9 14:11 57:21 92:16 107:10 108:2.21 117:10 133:10 135:14 152:16 165:5,16 166:14 179:22 194:17 196:17 206:9 214:16 222:18 239:12 249:4 exhibits 222:16 exist 56:10,13 **existing** 191:23 exists 57:6 153:13 exit 124:22 **expansion** 191:18,24 **expect** 14:5 56:7 110:9 141:2 149:6 163:2 214:14 227:13 231:4,8,12,23 233:2 expectations 185:17 **expected** 227:10,11 230:24 expecting 188:17 **experience** 9:14,17 21:13 50:8,10 52:19,20 57:13 183:13 **experiment** 37:14,22 45:13 173:17 **expert** 14:22 47:14,20 48:5

48:10 81:16 85:2 88:15 166:12 170:13 195:24,25 107:12 **expertise** 9:2,21 10:15 71:24 81:24 82:9,13,15 88:14 205:20 experts 48:1 **Expires** 252:23 **explain** 113:12 137:19 195:11 233:11 236:4 198:17 214:22 factually 147:9 **explained** 10:11 176:24 178:11 **explanation** 85:14 145:25 **explode** 139:20 **export** 143:15,18,23 144:11 **fairly** 22:20 146:20 148:14,23 164:1 **fall** 64:12 80:14 180:17 **exports** 180:23 **extend** 181:22 **extension** 11:4,6 183:19 186:4 extent 47:10 84:9 99:5 102:6 130:2 133:1 138:24 153:1 154:1 **extract** 113:19 extractable 197:4 **extraction** 197:1 198:8 199:25 203:1,10,12,16 205:4,7 209:16 extremely 31:10,16 34:4,4 39:16 **extremes** 179:17 eves 80:19 **E-mail** 214:16 217:23 F **F** 253:1 face 162:10 167:1 **faced** 96:5 facilities 136:7 **facing** 187:24 fact 10:2 49:8 86:1 91:20 110:2 133:24 165:25 171:20 177:17,23 218:6

**factor** 39:17,22 40:1 41:2,10

41:10 90:15 111:9 143:22

196:2 210:2 215:6 216:14 234:21 243:8 247:12 factors 39:21,24 40:3,17 41:5 42:1 132:25 139:7 146:12 155:17 169:1 189:2,4 200:10 217:14 221:22 **Fahrenheit** 235:15,18 fair 24:6 31:8 56:5 98:21 99:12 116:12 134:7 138:13 149:24 160:4 177:25 **falls** 38:22 64:14 81:4 99:13 132:21 215:8,22 familiar 13:8 22:7 91:10 153:16 171:23 187:12,13 194:7 222:3 226:6 **far** 65:25 101:9 131:4 142:9 153:8 162:1 188:18 197:11 201:12 232:18 249:20 **farm** 6:18,18 17:22 18:1,9,16 18:18 19:5,8 23:1,3,4,5,6,7 23:14,15 25:13 26:7,15 27:5 28:16 29:7,7,12,17 32:16,19 32:21,23 33:1,3,15 42:24 43:6 44:5 46:6,8,16,17,17 46:18,23 47:1,4 51:9 52:23 52:23 53:8,14 73:13 87:23 100:8,10 149:1 180:16,21 181:1,2,5,9 182:3,4,4,12,13 182:20 184:2,3,4,6,12 188:5 188:17,19,20 191:10 192:18 193:4 218:24 219:3,7 farmer 6:20,20 26:2,3,11 33:14 41:7,12,22 42:9 43:5 43:22 45:18 55:11,17 96:9 147:10 150:7 180:9,13 181:25 182:11,17,25 183:7 183:16 193:8,8 220:14 farmers 11:13 21:12 22:2 26:12,25 27:10,15 28:20 31:3 54:19 55:3,9,15 56:17

63:16 64:8 96:5 147:4 149:18,25 150:4 183:10,23 186:4,11,16 189:8 190:23 193:9 farming 49:15 179:24 farmland 6:22 **farms** 2:15 4:13 46:16 79:9 79:14 100:7 109:16 184:14 185:6 186:5,8 **farther** 90:14 94:16 138:15 143:9 fast 92:9 95:24 97:21 faster 110:10 **fate** 167:7,10 fates 69:3,12 126:8 127:3 **fathom** 190:19 Favetteville 2:14,20 **FD-36** 135:19 137:4 142:22 156:1 **fed** 97:8 154:1 **federal** 11:14 41:11 **feed** 55:7 70:9,15,19,21,24 71:7 72:7,11,19 153:6,20 154:1 167:14 180:7,12,14 181:9 188:3 189:12,20 193:10 feeding 97:18 193:2,5 **feel** 49:14 feet 66:12,16,19 **fell** 138:5 **felt** 9:20 235:7 fertility 6:11 15:19 237:19 238:6,19 fertilization 63:3 fertilized 98:4 fertilizer 30:24 31:4,17,22 32:3 33:4,5,6,6 43:25 55:5 55:13,21 64:6 82:24 83:3 87:9 91:8 96:14 98:5 113:7 113:23 119:17 153:7 154:12 168:14,20 169:14 182:4 239:13,14,22 240:17 241:9 242:9,15,24,25 243:1 246:1 246:14,18,18,21,22 fertilizers 96:6

**fescue** 108:9 **field** 12:21 16:4 22:16 25:15 27:11,11 29:23 34:3,5 37:23 38:15,16,18,20 41:4,24 42:20 43:3 45:12.18 46:2 69:22 78:2,3,5,7,8,9 82:24 82:25 83:2,25 87:5,5,10 98:8,25 99:2,3 105:13 110:17 123:12 124:10,11,13 124:22,23,23 125:3,3,4,12 125:17,19 126:17,18,23 127:6,11,11,12,22 128:2,4,4 128:5,6,7,7,14,18,25,25 130:17 131:19 132:5,8 141:2,8,9,9,12,17,19 142:10 142:10 151:10 156:14 179:9 190:8 200:18,20 201:3,17 201:21 202:5,5 213:10 214:13 219:5,7,15 229:12 241:20 249:9,11 fields 24:2,12 30:3,4,23 34:24 35:25 36:9,22 38:1,10 39:5 40:2,16 43:9 46:25 93:20 97:9 99:6 105:6 190:10 **fifteen** 6:5 59:4 90:6 119:18 fifteen-centimeter 114:19 figure 139:9 153:14 166:18 167:11,12 168:6 178:19 198:24 199:1 206:18 207:19 209:10 211:4 212:6 227:3 232:3 239:20 **figured** 140:1 216:11 217:7 **figures** 157:10 234:10 figuring 116:5 **fill** 187:16 **filter** 131:22,25 final 155:16 185:11 186:11 203:7 243:23 **finally** 156:22 214:24 **financial** 42:8 53:16 186:12 189:1 financially 32:21 find 27:13 95:6,8 97:16 124:19 160:24 162:12 163:2 181:25 182:2 183:21 222:19

229:9 finding 106:1 188:2 189:6 **findings** 95:13 fine 29:3 48:2 106:17 133:19 172:9 205:12 **Finish** 41:15 finished 107:8 firmly 162:18 **first** 4:25 5:14,16 7:12,19,19 14:3 16:17 25:7 28:8 48:14 58:10 77:15 88:24 90:16 93:7,10,18,18 96:17 100:5 101:16 103:12 105:3 109:6 109:22 111:8,16 112:11 127:5 133:21,22,23 137:14 142:15 150:20 151:20,23 153:3 192:25 196:23 202:18 213:1 224:3,21,21 227:8,12 230:18 234:17 237:1 244:21 247:5 253:9 **firsthand** 21:11,13 30:12 52:20 **Fisher** 132:11 **fit** 121:25 Fitzgerald 9:6 **FIV** 238:5,18 248:12 249:1 **five** 101:20 103:3 228:21 231:10 240:18 241:7 246:5 246:25 five-minute 44:19 **fixed** 83:22,22 126:25 **fixing** 139:22 **flat** 120:2 **flip** 33:2 165:5 177:12 flooding 24:5 Florida 190:11,24 flow 9:19 123:21 124:22 128:1 137:15 148:7,15,23 168:12 169:6 172:8 173:7 174:20,25 175:1,4,6 176:7 185:22,25 **flows** 81:6 **flumes** 136:10 focus 7:4 51:9 148:9 149:4 220:2

**folks** 56:12 151:22 follow 37:12 169:17 190:12 **followed** 179:20 following 44:24 77:9 84:22 106:20 145:7 152:11 175:23 195:2 212:23 233:25 follows 5:2 FOODS 1:11 2:12 **footnotes** 100:11 **forage** 20:4,6,6,8,10 21:8 43:16 54:25 55:5 63:17 64:2 65:8,11,18,19,22 66:11 67:11 68:21 97:2,14,18 98:14,17 100:8 101:17,19 102:3 103:22 104:3 105:5 105:10,20 108:8 109:18,25 113:16 114:8 188:3 189:12 189:20 206:16 **forages** 95:21 101:24,24 foregoing 252:4 253:16 forget 13:16 26:22 157:13 187:18 **form** 20:24 21:21 22:9 23:12 24:17 27:22 28:7 30:21 31:11 33:13 34:1,15 35:16 36:15 37:1 40:18 41:8 42:3 43:4 44:9 46:12 47:16 50:3 51:14,20 53:23 54:7 67:14 68:5,18 72:14,21 73:2 74:2 74:16 75:20 76:16 77:1,3,7 79:3,5,25 80:3 81:19 83:9 84:14 85:22 86:3,7 88:11 110:18 120:15 124:3 128:19 130:18 131:8 134:23 143:19 144:22 145:4,20 146:23 149:15 150:6,25 154:15,17 158:9 159:2,8,11,21 160:9 160:18 161:2,6,13,21 162:4 162:7,23 164:2,6,12,19 168:13,19 169:22 170:2,18 182:9,23 183:9 190:5 193:16 222:8 250:4 253:14 **formation** 190:18 **forms** 56:13 57:5 187:16 228:2

formulations 71:25 **forward** 21:18 **found** 60:22 102:25 107:4 110:6 **four** 100:6,7,17,19 103:4,18 104:16 132:14 176:4 228:20 236:12 fourth 102:23 105:2 fractured 132:19 **fragmented** 153:21 154:5 Frank 1:15 3:4 4:4,24 5:7 83:10 252:3,12 254:1 frequency 14:25 230:25 233:13 frequent 232:21 frequently 93:12 fresh 76:11 93:12 135:6 215:25 217:8,13,15,19,25 freshly 215:7 216:15 **fueled** 135:9 full 109:22 142:15 198:14 253:17 **fully** 100:10 192:9 206:6 fun 238:8 **fund** 50:11,14,23,25 **funded** 51:5 **funds** 51:1 **further** 45:12 129:6 138:11 139:16 142:24 143:14,22 144:10 145:16,16,18 148:13 150:18 154:9 157:14,15 253:16,19 **future** 191:17

### G

G 3:3
gas 139:22 235:19
gauges 136:11
Gburek 152:22,23 222:21,22
gendered 182:11
general 1:5 2:6 8:21 9:14
12:7,8 19:14,17 20:12,13
33:18 35:18 62:23 65:14,22
85:14 88:13,24 108:15,20
115:11 117:5 118:25 151:1

151:2 162:16 170:1,20,21 171:9 184:2 202:9 211:16 228:6 240:7 **generality** 15:22 170:8 generalization 201:2 generally 16:8 51:23,25 52:4 54:16 62:22 64:9,10 77:15 85:8 95:22 106:10 115:14 134:17 135:4,6,12,13 167:22 168:11 169:11,14 171:14 176:22 217:18 228:10 **generate** 150:19 156:13 163:19 230:24,25 231:5 233:2 **generated** 25:13 28:10 75:8 76:17,20 77:18 78:2,7,9,16 124:21 125:17 127:15 128:24 137:17,22,23 138:8 138:10,17,21 144:17 145:13 146:7,9 149:6 166:10 184:6 189:24 196:6,7 201:7 227:17 generic 166:1 generous 116:8 250:17 gentlemen 211:1 geographic 192:13 **geologic** 190:18 geology 126:13 132:12 190:15 George's 2:19 4:14 **getting** 15:13 19:7 31:10 33:9 49:14 77:20,23 88:24 147:24 148:24 155:11 158:21,22 159:24 190:24 191:20 **give** 6:9 15:12 17:4 26:20 37:11 39:11 44:5 61:20 64:2 71:19 86:6 124:9 145:24 183:2 189:11 193:20 213:12 235:10 237:10 given 21:16 25:4 40:14 84:10 128:20 150:7 158:15 231:6 gives 151:5 206:14 207:11 giving 203:24

**gleaned** 49:13 Globally 151:3 **go** 16:24 21:1,3 24:18,19,23 33:14 37:21 78:18 84:18 87:23 89:17 94:9 95:25 102:23 106:8 107:7 112:2 114:25 117:10 122:7 123:1 124:23 125:4,25 126:1 127:21 141:13 147:18 151:8 152:6 156:18 158:23 176:23 178:7 182:19 185:1 187:23 190:13 194:15,16 195:6 200:23 201:21 203:6 208:4 209:5 219:7 220:11,13 226:20 227:1,3,15 233:18 233:21,22 240:25 247:16 **goal** 6:17 35:17,18 97:20 110:19 114:1,3 151:19 159:1,3 205:18 **goals** 142:17 148:8 goes 18:22 52:19 70:9 72:11 72:19 75:4,5 92:8 95:24 102:13 126:19 183:14 197:11,21,21,22 207:7 going 8:23 10:12 14:18 18:5 18:24 20:5,11 24:24 25:2 26:10 30:22 34:3.7 43:7 46:19,21 47:21 48:7 52:22 57:23 68:19 74:7 76:13 77:8 83:11,15 89:1 90:18 93:6 95:22 96:13 104:13 107:3,3 113:18 120:3 126:10 139:21 140:11 141:1 141:9,13 143:17 149:6 152:1 157:2 158:18 162:10 166:9,10 175:17 177:25 178:2 187:3 190:12 192:19 193:23 198:15 201:22 207:13 208:17 211:18 225:4 229:6,9 230:13 232:12 233:9,9,12,13 235:11 236:19 237:9 238:7 240:24 245:16,16,17,19,22 246:1,2 246:11,13,17 248:7 250:8 250:22

**good** 8:14 25:7 29:3 33:1 47:9 49:9 88:2 104:19 106:13,24 116:15 139:13 140:10,24 141:11 149:9,10 149:11 150:16 153:14 197:13 217:21 250:25 **Gordon** 14:21 79:20 86:15 90:2 **Gotcha** 225:5 gotten 212:11 governing 193:24 gradient 130:20 grain 70:8,19,22 71:3,5 100:9 101:20 103:21 104:1 189:16 189:17,22,23 190:3,9 grains 71:17 95:12 101:20,25 **grant** 11:9 82:16 156:13 graph 211:4 212:1 **grass** 20:9 54:25 55:6 63:2 65:11 66:6 68:22 69:19 108:9 109:13 113:17 172:7 173:1,4,5 174:2,13 grasses 20:6,6,11 43:5,23 62:13,21,22 65:8,18,19,22 66:11 67:11 107:19 108:8 **gravity** 130:20 **grazing** 69:2 98:3 **great** 157:14 215:19 greater 20:3 103:20 109:17 148:18,22 168:11 175:18,19 203:14 205:6 221:4 230:17 231:1,16,25 234:7 238:17 241:18,25 greatest 148:14,17 **greatly** 192:12 **grew** 103:9 gross 166:12 196:9 204:17 **grossly** 37:20 ground 70:5 75:4,5,25 125:23 groundwater 154:13 group 26:20 243:6 grouped 240:1 groups 11:24 26:19,24 27:9 grow 23:24 55:7 91:1 96:21 113:18

**grower** 114:22 181:4 growing 6:21 32:24 43:5 70:14 88:6 97:14 113:17 150:15,15 189:15,17,22,23 190:21 241:20 grown 65:15,16 70:10 95:21 154:2 **grows** 154:2 **growth** 15:11 19:6 45:20 88:10 102:15 113:9 135:7 153:4 154:5 guess 8:18 68:13 105:1,20 132:3,11 133:11 189:7 216:6 217:3 223:21 225:10 237:4 guessing 240:24 **guidance** 64:13 170:21 182:25 184:19,19,20 guidances 64:22 guidelines 151:5 guv 101:3 235:12 G-B-U-R-E-K 222:19

# <u>H</u> H 16:17 22:21,23,24 133:15

half 100:22 147:3 196:25 246:24 halfway 112:25 133:23 202:18 Hammons 2:5 4:9,9,11 139:22 140:1 **hand** 13:7 92:16 133:10.12 235:8 252:8 253:22 **handed** 152:15 **handing** 133:11 **handle** 217:15 **handy** 165:15 Hang 13:9 135:17 165:24 168:15 177:16 **happen** 40:6,21,23 70:7 112:14 122:23 146:5,6 165:2 196:16 201:17,18 231:2 234:22,23 235:21 happened 10:7 21:22,23 22:18 31:7 140:21

happens 22:20 77:6,11,12 99:14 112:16 125:22 126:5 126:13 127:5,8,10 166:6 175:2 234:24 236:4 244:2 hard 107:5 190:19 202:12 hardship 96:4 harvest 108:12 114:7 118:4 119:6 168:1 harvested 95:13 101:18,19 102:8 Harvesting 109:25 hauling 56:2 192:11 hay 102:3,9,9,18 108:12 109:4 110:7,8 **hazardous** 59:17,18 head 87:22 230:11 237:16 header 224:15 headers 234:11 236:11 heading 100:12 137:11 156:20 167:7 187:23 **headings** 236:15,16 **healthy** 71:19 hear 10:5 223:15 231:9 **heard** 10:3 110:23 218:18 hearing 5:20,20,24 10:11,17 10:21 11:1 12:5,10 13:1 50:22 58:11 101:3 131:21 201:20 **hectare** 100:16,19,21 153:12 157:13 169:12 172:22 173:21 174:16,21 176:1 225:6,13,21 229:15,23 239:23 240:5 244:22 heightened 123:13 held 62:10 112:5 123:5 **help** 19:6 27:24 50:14 53:2 57:6 99:21 114:21 116:13 149:7 150:16 185:16 187:7 187:20 194:4 197:19 220:4 220:16 223:16 **helped** 94:2 **helpful** 202:10 **helping** 50:11 **Herron** 167:23

**heterogeneous** 16:19,20,25

270

18:23 hey 53:2 hid 168:18 **high** 30:20 31:5,10,16,23 32:2.6 34:25 38:16 39:15.16 42:25 44:3 46:1 85:9,12,15 85:16 91:18 96:11,18,20 101:8 107:1 109:25 113:7 120:12,12 128:4 129:5 130:17 141:2,8,12,17 142:22 151:7,7 159:20,24 160:6,12,12 162:21 164:11 178:24 179:1 219:1,1,18,20 224:1,1 225:18,20 226:4,4 227:22,22 228:13 230:15,15 234:11,12,18,18,18 236:10 236:10,20 237:11,24 245:17 248:4.4 **higher** 15:8,24 26:15 30:25 34:14 37:9 38:18,19,21,24 38:25 40:15,15 72:2 104:1 112:1 126:17 128:24 188:17 188:18 216:4,5 220:1 227:15 241:21 **highest** 233:7 236:21 241:24 highlighted 165:8,10 highly 91:1,5 93:22 136:1,4 136:15 170:2 hill 2:9 4:17,17 69:8 124:16 **hinder** 187:10 **hinges** 193:3 historic 64:16 90:2 190:14 historical 91:6 historically 20:21 21:6 63:1 71:16 72:3 233:8 history 84:10 hit 112:21 129:8 hold 83:9 181:20 **holding** 12:22 hole 130:24 homogenous 17:1 honest 161:25 honestly 58:8 59:14 200:23 201:11

honesty 162:1

hope 202:12 233:16 hopefully 31:19 162:17 horizontal 100:12 hours 8:25 116:6 **house** 45:6 houses 60:5 182:17 **human** 240:5 **hump** 124:15 hun 80:4 **hundred** 239:5 hundreds 79:23 80:1 hung 36:5 hurt 230:11 **hydrologic** 148:5 197:8 hydrology 203:18 205:9 hypothetical 36:8 40:7,9,13 40:14 82:22 119:9 122:23 hypotheticals 37:20

### Ι

ideal 25:19 190:6,16 191:6

ice 240:13

idea 217:14 222:6

**ideally** 190:12 identical 13:22 34:23 35:10 36:10,22 38:2,10 39:5,14 40:2,16 177:15,16 identify 4:6 84:4 220:12 **ignored** 212:14 **ignores** 214:24 **III** 100:25 115:8,13 116:13 116:17 142:17 143:14 144:9 156:3 197:2 198:3,9 199:13 200:3 202:20 208:11 211:5 238:23 Illinois 16:9,11,14 21:24 22:2 30:1,7 47:11,14 55:23 60:2 60:6,13 61:2,15 67:5,11 70:9,10 72:7,11,13,20 73:1 73:6,25 74:23 75:17 77:2,10 77:21,25 78:25 79:10 80:11 80:17,21,24 81:9,18 85:5 88:9,21 90:11 92:4 94:5 99:4 102:7,17 120:13 124:1 124:19 126:13 130:2 134:20

136:16,21,23 137:5 140:16 142:8 154:1 159:6,9,14,18 160:5 161:16 162:3,8,16,20 163:7 184:15 250:3,10,19 illustrated 153:25 **imagine** 196:17 imbalance 193:4 **imbalances** 153:6 193:3 **immediate** 157:5,20 **immediately** 97:1 212:22 240:19 241:14,15 **impact** 9:18 37:6 123:24 243:23 **impacted** 149:20 **impaired** 134:1,5 161:17 imperial 225:24 **implement** 185:4 186:13 187:3.4 **implies** 188:13,14 203:14 205:5 215:1 **import** 163:25 importance 39:18 **important** 79:19 87:3 110:1 116:18 204:13 243:7 **importantly** 138:23 156:22 **imported** 70:19,22 **imports** 180:22 **imposed** 121:17 impossible 28:13 **improve** 28:2 151:19 **improved** 151:24 inaccurate 154:24 171:13 **inappropriate** 24:3 104:20 inches 65:23 231:10,11 include 113:7 181:12 184:19 **included** 13:5 249:13 **includes** 87:12 including 69:3,12 186:7 incorporate 111:18 **incorporated** 127:2 228:3 240:19,19 241:13,18,22,23 **incorporation** 111:10 148:4 incorrect 14:23 15:5,17 increase 89:13 94:17,25 128:7 143:15,17 144:11

146:3,4,20 214:1,3 increased 55:6 76:3 112:7 121:7 143:21,23 146:8 155:17 176:17 increases 95:1 112:8 242:8 increasing 111:19 129:24 143:21 240:25 incremental 150:9 independent 121:21 122:11 122:20 independently 247:3 index 10:16,24 11:16 12:12 12:17 35:7,17,22 36:3,17,24 37:3,4,6,7,9,13 38:8,14,18 39:2,9 43:11 46:20 54:1,12 116:20 150:24 151:3,12,15 163:1,6,9,13,19,22 184:12 184:22 218:20,21 219:3,11 219:21,25 220:5,19,21 221:19 222:4,18 223:4,5 224:6 227:2 235:3,7 236:5 238:6,19 249:8 250:2,9,17 **indexing** 247:22 **indicate** 49:6 95:13 indicated 56:20 104:7 **indicates** 13:4 106:9 indices 11:3 49:4 82:3 139:4 151:20 179:8 220:23 223:7 indisputable 214:12 **individual** 180:9 181:18 188:16 193:8,9 214:10 236:18 individuals 11:11 12:15,23 26:24 49:12 56:17 235:6 250:15 industry 11:23 153:5 180:8 192:4 industry-wide 53:16 **infiltrate** 125:5,15 126:1 infiltrates 126:23 **infiltration** 125:1 132:20 133:1 **information** 8:24 73:18 89:1 89:7 92:10 99:8 116:11 212:23 226:21 249:16

**ingested** 102:10 **initial** 8:10 **injected** 135:9 241:9 **injunction** 5:20 10:10,21 12:5.9 13:1 **innovative** 188:5 191:10 **inorganic** 65:9,12 **input** 43:22 49:14 62:12 153:6 inputs 180:15 181:5,8 **inquiry** 214:20 **inside** 32:23 **instance** 15:12 17:21 24:2 32:12 142:16 235:10 instances 22:18 31:21 104:1 institutional 187:8 **instruct** 83:15 instructive 35:18 249:21,23 instrumentation 136:11,13 instrumented 136:15 **intact** 18:25 integrated 180:10 integrator 180:8 **integrators** 11:18 50:1,25 51:6,12,19 52:9 53:11 54:4 194:1,3,7 **intend** 165:4 **intense** 179:19 intensification 153:4 intensity 178:24 intent 170:20 197:16 **interaction** 137:11 241:11 intercept 210:2 interchangeably 57:4 **interested** 10:14 145:15 233:18 253:21 interface 6:12 **interim** 156:23 157:1 interpose 147:15 **interpret** 148:20 150:10 158:2 189:14 227:11 **interpretation** 92:12 145:5 213:9 217:17,22 224:25 229:1 232:25 234:25 interpreted 213:2,7

**interpreting** 137:20 213:8 235:6 **intersection** 219:15,16 **intimate** 250:13 **intimately** 184:17 222:5 introduce 145:6 introduced 83:17 185:25 190:10 **introduction** 93:17,19 144:15 **introductory** 157:11 164:22 involve 53:3,4 187:25 involved 6:6 8:6 10:17 12:11 12:18,22 46:14 49:11,12,23 50:8,11 52:6 61:6 151:22 188:14 involvement 12:14 **Iowa** 189:16,17 190:4,10,20 190:23 **iron** 127:1 129:16 168:5 185:23 **IRW** 16:13 20:5 21:12 30:15 31:19,22 32:2,6,9 49:3,15 65:20 107:15,19 132:25 135:3 170:14 196:2 isolated 56:10 isolation 144:24 issue 57:17 150:3,7 159:15 177:11 180:19 issues 6:11,12 7:14,15 8:21 8:22 10:16,16 11:12 161:23 items 57:14

#### J

J 56:9 Jackson 2:24 January 1:18 4:4 253:23 job 26:12 180:13,22 Joern 58:21,23,24 John 2:12 4:16 Johnson 56:19 79:20 86:15 86:16 89:23 90:2,9 92:8,11 119:10 120:22 122:5 160:19 160:25 195:10,12,14 196:1 196:20 199:4 206:3 212:25 213:6,24

272

Johnson's 14:22 30:9 107:25 198:19,20 199:4 206:12,13 207:22 211:2 212:24 Jones 9:8,10 journal 171:3,4,10 journals 32:1 judge 83:11,16 judgment 114:24 161:5 228:17,18 229:8 243:7,19 jumping 239:9 jumps 174:18 jury 5:6

# K

justifies 243:10

**J-O-E-R-N** 58:23

**justify** 242:16

**K** 2:19 4:14 17:8,16 57:1 **Karst** 126:13,15 132:12 keep 51:11 83:10 110:16 117:14,16 149:25 150:4 165:15 187:17 **kilogram** 101:10 142:23 143:13 144:9 174:21 176:1 199:14,21 226:1 248:13 kilograms 100:16,19,25 142:23,25 153:12 157:12 169:11 172:22 173:20 174:16 225:25 239:23 240:5 **kind** 7:14 9:12 10:11 14:4 24:1 32:6 49:5 54:17 61:7 62:1 78:5 91:24 98:2 130:13 136:23 139:13,16,17 140:23 170:1 173:8,16 178:14 179:7 190:19 222:1 232:23 240:9 249:7 kinds 124:18 kinetics 118:2 **Kleinman** 203:22 **know** 7:4 8:4,12,23 9:10 10:13 11:22 12:1,6 18:3 19:20,21 21:12 22:19 30:15 31:7 39:11 47:8,12,19 48:7 50:21 52:8 53:24 55:22 56:1,3 58:21 59:1,2,20,24

60:4,8,9,17,19 61:10,13 62:4 65:20 66:13,14,17 67:8 67:23 68:6,6 70:11,12,18,21 70:24 71:1,9,14 72:4,6 73:7 73:14 74:11,17,18,22 75:17 77:10,12,24 78:1,3,12,14 79:6,8,11,15,16 81:11,16,24 82:5,21 83:2,6,7 84:3 85:7 88:23 89:5 100:3 102:16,20 116:13,15 120:17 123:25 124:5,7 127:1 130:5,7,9,10 132:9 133:4 134:19 136:22 136:25 137:6 139:16 141:4 142:9 143:2 151:6 156:5,10 156:25 157:3 160:11,13 161:8,8,10,24 162:8 163:12 164:7 167:21,23 178:8 183:8,15 184:14,17 193:7 194:12,13 200:8,12 203:3 214:4,6 217:11,16,18,24 218:8 221:10,11,15 227:5,8 227:9 228:5 234:9,17 235:1 235:14 236:6.14 237:14.21 240:1,6 242:12,18 243:2,10 243:11 244:14 249:20 250:15,20 knowing 83:6 116:12 146:24 **knowingly** 104:21 170:7 **knowledge** 7:19 21:11 30:12 31:18 47:13 48:18 71:2,9 73:4 78:10,13 79:12 85:2,6 114:19 130:7 164:7 170:22

# L

214:8 229:8 250:13

134:8 216:21

119:25

known 59:4 63:23 75:15

**knows** 60:10 102:21 214:9

**Kratochvil** 92:23,24 93:4

L 57:7 label 224:7,8 laboratory 88:3 lack 147:16 laid 213:5 216:2 lake 201:5 **lakes** 134:3 **land** 7:6 11:9 60:7,13 61:1,4 61:15 74:23 75:18 87:17 91:6 100:21 109:1 112:20 120:5 123:25 124:8 138:15 138:15 144:20 149:19,20 155:18 156:13 159:20 160:7 167:7,16 206:16 216:25 219:2 221:1 250:18 lands 112:20 164:11 landscape 7:10 9:18,20 46:24 73:17 74:6 149:5 150:13,18 170:13 222:1 land's 217:2 large 15:23 54:25 58:9 74:10 174:8 176:8 219:16 larger 15:6 20:8 192:13 largest 62:12 large-scale 195:16 lateral 83:23 laterally 66:7 laughed 49:8 Law 2:3,9,13,16,19,22 laws 1:21 lawsuit 21:7 **lawver** 8:17 lav 215:25 lavers 111:12,23 **laying** 75:25 **leaching** 69:13 70:4 112:9,13 154:13 169:4 **lead** 92:21 93:4 152:20 leaks 126:12 **learn** 12:7 79:19 151:25 learned 32:8 49:9 75:22 151:18 leased 29:1 leave 140:5 182:20 leaves 74:4 140:6 158:6 201:17,21 **left** 100:8 190:8 215:2 216:8 229:24,25 240:25 241:3 242:8 **left-hand** 100:6 111:7 112:24

273

249:2

133:20 142:15 172:11 246:7 **legal** 50:4 51:15,21 legumes 20:6 **lesser** 30:25 **letter** 164:23 let's 14:13 16:16 20:4 23:25 24:14 38:7 39:4 44:20 45:11 65:18 67:17 69:16 84:18 92:14 93:6,11 99:17 102:23 106:4,16 107:7 109:6,10,22,24 111:6,8 117:10 121:1 123:1 133:24 137:8 142:14 143:10 152:8 153:1 155:21 156:18,18 164:20 165:21 166:14,17 167:3,4 171:17 172:1 174:20 176:23 180:2,5 185:1 187:6,23 188:7 194:15 195:6 196:22 199:8 202:14 203:6 205:24 206:13 208:16,16 219:7 222:19,24 223:18 233:21 234:4 236:7 239:20 level 20:17,18,18 23:14,15 26:15 31:2 36:10 37:8 38:19 39:19,25 40:4 48:9 50:9 53:6,14 72:2 74:10,11 76:21 87:4 91:7 96:10 97:21 103:18 105:15 114:9 120:13 143:1 144:5 146:3 164:18 171:9 199:10 213:1 214:1 217:9,12 219:4,6,7,8 219:9 levels 7:7 31:16 32:2 36:1 37:4 63:8 76:7,8 94:25 95:16 97:17 103:11 105:14 105:25 106:10 108:10,23,25 109:16 110:3,19 113:14 114:4 121:6 135:9 162:13 164:10 234:20 **lies** 180:8 **life** 213:10 limestone 132:19 **limit** 24:22 42:1 63:14 139:18

187:9 221:1,5 248:6,9,12,24

**limitation** 96:2,4 147:11 **limited** 63:21 96:16 147:3 221:2 limiting 40:17 41:5 88:8 line 16:18 39:11 63:14 89:6 105:2 186:24 193:12 197:5 211:15 223:25 224:3 232:19 243:24 254:3 **linear** 119:20 120:8 122:17 198:12,21 211:8 lines 17:4 110:22 132:14 196:25 213:23 239:13 links 192:11 Lisa 1:19 13:14,16 252:5 253:6,24 list 57:8,10,12 **listed** 7:17 57:14 92:25 **listen** 53:2 liter 199:17,18,23 211:6 **literature** 57:14 75:15 216:22 **litter** 16:8,18 17:5,19 18:10 18:12,17 19:16,20,23 20:11 20:13,22 21:7,13,15,17 22:5 22:12 23:4,5,11,13,15,17,19 23:22 24:3,12,13,22 25:11 27:5,9,10,11,16,23 28:1,6 28:18,20,22 29:2,18,19,21 30:11,18 32:12,22,25 33:10 33:21,23 34:3,13,24 36:14 36:25 41:3,20,24 42:2,14,21 43:6,9,24 44:7,15 45:6,8,25 46:22 47:7 50:1,6,14,23,25 51:2,13,19 52:2,4,23 54:19 55:4,12,17,23 56:2 57:9,16 60:2,5,6,14 61:5,8,17 63:1 63:14,18,21,22,24,25 65:1 66:20 67:12,12,25 68:6,19 68:24 69:21 70:2 71:3,6 74:9 75:5,6,19,25 76:11,11 77:13 83:4 96:9,12,16 98:5 106:6 108:24 109:2,11 110:16 111:9 113:8,25 114:7,12,23 116:15,22 127:5 128:5 145:10,13

160:8,16,17 166:2 172:3,21 172:23 173:21 174:18 175:3 176:9,15 181:13,19 182:1,3 182:12,14 183:11,24,24 184:2,5,16,23 185:6 188:2,3 189:7,12,18,20,21,24 190:3 192:16 216:19,25 217:19,25 221:2 litter-originated 84:7 little 12:17 21:5 39:4 42:18 45:11 90:14 94:15 99:22 120:20 135:23 143:6,9 152:6 155:1,22 166:16 167:4 181:9 188:8 193:10 201:12,25 223:8,9,9,16 242:21 livestock 93:21 97:8 153:4,21 154:10 **LLC** 4:18 **load** 51:2,3 100:17 127:16 172:8 229:22 loaded 188:12,22 **loading** 109:2 **loam** 172:9 loams 137:1 local 48:18 141:23 locally 28:9 189:23 **location** 23:18 25:11 27:16 46:1,2 50:7 67:3 97:25 181:16 185:21 192:16 231:23,25 **locations** 24:15 50:2 80:5 99:10 100:7 101:21 103:4 103:19 104:17 144:25 logic 60:21 242:18 **logical** 40:25 111:17 long 6:3 95:25 96:23 106:8 116:7 120:11 171:24,24 202:18 232:1 longer 24:24 63:16 71:21 96:9 125:15 129:9 130:20 215:20 231:3 234:5 241:21 long-term 93:24 128:17 181:11,15 185:5 **look** 7:18,21 14:14 16:16

28:13 42:17 58:6 78:18 79:20 92:14 93:6 97:1 100:5,11 109:6,22 111:6 120:1 131:15,18,20 145:13 151:8 156:19 164:20 165:22 166:14,17 167:3 172:1 174:20 177:8 181:19 182:7 182:21 190:1 196:22 198:12 198:13,18 199:12 202:14 205:24 206:14 213:13 218:23 223:7 226:20 233:18 234:5 236:7 240:24 242:22 **looked** 12:5 30:6,8 37:24 47:11 55:25 58:17 59:15 76:24 79:21,22 80:6 86:14 92:7 108:7,8,9,22,24 131:15 163:5,8,21 167:12 171:24 177:2 195:20 204:23 244:5 **looking** 6:11 13:24 29:5 53:13 57:12 78:1,4 117:11 117:17 133:20 135:21 169:2 183:10 200:7 217:12 240:12 246:7 looks 13:19,22 177:15,16 222:22 223:5,12 246:8 **loss** 6:21 35:20 38:15 44:3 117:9 121:7 149:2 150:17 151:7,7 162:14 166:11 168:10 169:2,10 170:13 173:7 175:6 181:17 205:14 214:25 219:2 220:1,4,13 223:22 241:21 243:21 248:1 losses 39:16 116:25 123:12 133:8 **lost** 43:13 168:15 180:21 217:15 244:21 **lot** 7:5 59:3 66:5 72:23 74:22 75:2 125:4,7 127:3 178:22 186:24,25 201:13,13 204:23 216:5 219:17,19 223:14 225:12 228:12 229:7,8 249:22,24 **love** 238:7 **low** 34:24 38:15 46:2 130:22

151:6 168:3 169:5 218:25

224:1 225:5,13 226:4 227:6 227:6,14,14,21,21 228:13 230:14 234:11,18 236:10 237:11,23 238:5,12 239:22 244:21 245:1,2,2,2 248:4 249:5 lower 33:7,7 34:13 37:7 38:20 104:3 109:11 111:11 111:21 112:2 126:18 127:11 155:8 166:17 167:6 lowest 236:20 luck 49:9 lunch 106:14,20 107:13

#### $\mathbf{M}$

**M** 115:12 macronutrient 54:24 **magic** 60:14 magnitude 217:1 maintain 63:9 105:15 186:13 maintains 133:25 **maintenance** 188:4 191:9 **major** 100:11 134:2,21 **majority** 103:1 197:8 makers 56:18 making 18:16 25:18 28:8,20 33:15 88:7 187:1 208:6 male 182:11 manage 6:17 12:20 17:24 26:14 27:2 186:17 managed 17:22 23:14 25:22 29:1 47:4 183:25 193:5 management 6:12 8:21 18:9 18:16 19:19 23:1,3,8 24:8 28:11,17 29:17 32:8 44:6 46:18 47:5,7,9 51:9 53:6,13 54:15 62:13 87:23 147:13 149:1 151:5,9 155:10 157:6 157:20,23 158:8 162:11 179:24 180:6 183:25 184:19 186:2 187:2 197:9 203:14 203:18 205:5,9 218:22,23 218:24 220:3,14 **managing** 23:9,15

manipulative 87:21

**manmade** 99:15 manner 19:7 23:7 26:7 27:7 manufacture 180:12 manure 29:8 46:15 50:16 64:15,20 69:1,11,18,25 77:16 82:25 83:1,4 93:24,25 94:10 95:16 96:7,10 97:7,19 97:21,24 99:5,9 100:14 103:3 110:4 113:22 114:21 115:15 116:10 144:20 145:11,12 147:10,11 149:4 149:21 150:5,13 154:9 155:7,10 167:16 168:14,20 169:14 181:13 182:1 185:6 188:2,3 189:6,12,19,21 191:15 192:7,8,11 214:25 215:7,10,16,17,25 216:3,6 216:15,15 217:8,13,15 map 135:23 155:22 **margin** 246:7 **margins** 194:2 mark 13:8.11 marked 57:21 92:16 107:10 133:10 152:15 165:16 196:17 214:15 market 194:2 **Maryland** 5:9,11 6:4 11:3 12:12,16 26:23 29:9 30:2 31:3,13 38:8,14 39:9 50:10 50:14,17,18,22 52:20 71:11 183:20 184:4,11,11 187:13 187:20 193:21,21 237:20 243:14,15,17 248:6 249:14 mass 102:13 match 210:15 **matched** 180:16 material 33:21 58:17 66:24 221:23 materials 57:11 58:1,9,12,14 58:19 66:24 89:3 107:25 163:14 214:17 math 175:11,12 206:3,8 207:4 209:12 210:11,16 212:8 223:9

matter 10:2 16:6 29:24 32:17

32:18 49:8 68:14 115:11	121:4,21 122:14 123:17
118:12,13 127:2	136:7 141:1,11,19 142:3
maximal 228:20	156:11 158:1,4,13 160:11
maximize 32:16	170:2 171:1 188:10 189:13
maximizing 32:17	189:14 191:19 192:14 203:2
<b>maximum</b> 6:19 20:15 63:22	216:21 219:11 220:5 224:24
64:3,4 65:23 113:19 138:24	225:3 226:18 227:11 229:14
<b>McCollum</b> 106:2 107:4 111:4	230:14,20,21 231:2,17
McCollum's 95:13	245:9,23
<b>McDaniel</b> 2:15 4:12,12 11:19	meaning 7:14 32:15 116:10
13:10,13 14:2 16:21,24	144:5 158:2,3 159:25
20:24 21:2,10,21 22:9 23:12	means 12:17 14:19 16:25
24:16 27:22 28:7 30:21	37:18 111:23,25 113:12
31:11 33:13 34:1,15 35:1,16	120:3 137:19 149:19 154:5
36:15 37:1,19 40:18,24 41:6	157:4 161:9 185:5 203:3
41:8,15 42:3 43:4 44:9	214:23 227:9 234:18 237:7
46:12 47:3,16,23 48:6 50:3	241:8,19
51:14,20,24 53:23 54:7,13	meant 89:12 170:4 217:17
67:14 68:5,18 69:6 71:5	measure 83:24 156:24 157:1
72:14,21 73:2 74:2,16,21	229:14
75:20 76:16 77:1,3,7 79:3,5	measured 78:7 137:15
79:25 80:3 81:19 82:18	measurement 88:7 229:13
83:9 84:14 85:22 86:3,7	measurements 232:21
88:11 92:17 95:7 99:25	measures 185:4 186:13
106:15,17 108:2 110:18	measuring 88:3
115:20,24 116:2 120:15	mechanism 31:10 75:13 84:3
124:3 128:19 130:18 134:23	123:18
139:24 140:6,10 143:19,25	mechanisms 32:5 73:16
144:22 145:4,20,24 146:23	81:11 128:9
147:15,23 149:15 150:6,25	medium 151:6 219:1 224:1
152:5 154:15,17 158:9	225:16 226:4 227:21 228:13
159:2,8,11,21 160:3,9,18	230:14 234:11,18 236:10
161:2,6,13,21 162:4,7,23	237:11,24 238:12 247:9,10
164:2,6,12,19 169:22	248:4,19 249:5
170:18 182:9,23 183:9	meet 8:20 9:4 20:10,22 21:8
190:5 193:16 194:5,9,16,19	63:17
207:21 210:25 213:20 218:9	meeting 8:19 9:5,13 10:1
218:12 239:1,4,9 250:4	194:2 212:22
mean 11:6,19 15:4,5 16:14,20	meets 64:18
18:14 19:2,8,10 22:11 36:4	megagrams 225:7,8,16
37:15 38:20,24 42:5 60:5	229:15
63:20 73:10 78:22 87:25	<b>Mehlich</b> 100:24 115:8,13
89:11 96:8 97:10 101:23	116:12,17 142:17 143:13
103:7,25 105:9 111:13	144:9 156:3 197:2 198:3,9
113:23 114:11 118:7 120:25	199:13 200:3 202:20 208:11
	1

```
121:4,21 122:14 123:17
136:7 141:1,11,19 142:3
156:11 158:1,4,13 160:11
170:2 171:1 188:10 189:13
189:14 191:19 192:14 203:2
216:21 219:11 220:5 224:24
225:3 226:18 227:11 229:14
230:14,20,21 231:2,17
245:9,23
eaning 7:14 32:15 116:10
144:5 158:2,3 159:25
eans 12:17 14:19 16:25
37:18 111:23,25 113:12
120:3 137:19 149:19 154:5
157:4 161:9 185:5 203:3
214:23 227:9 234:18 237:7
241:8,19
eant 89:12 170:4 217:17
easure 83:24 156:24 157:1
229:14
easured 78:7 137:15
easurement 88:7 229:13
easurements 232:21
easures 185:4 186:13
easuring 88:3
echanism 31:10 75:13 84:3
123:18
echanisms 32:5 73:16
81:11 128:9
edium 151:6 219:1 224:1
225:16 226:4 227:21 228:13
230:14 234:11,18 236:10
237:11,24 238:12 247:9,10
248:4,19 249:5
eet 8:20 9:4 20:10,22 21:8
63:17
eeting 8:19 9:5,13 10:1
194:2 212:22
eets 64:18
egagrams 225:7,8,16
229:15
[ehlich 100:24 115:8,13
116:12,17 142:17 143:13
144:9 156:3 197:2 198:3,9
```

211:5 238:23 **memory** 140:9 mental 37:14,22 **mention** 89:23 mentioned 28:23 36:2 95:23 114:13 155:15 170:19 210:13 237:17 mentioning 56:25 168:25 191:7 met 8:14,24 meters 139:1,14 140:21 141:3 141:6,14 229:23 231:17,25 232:9,18 233:6,10,16 **method** 88:3 168:13,19 239:14,18 240:17 242:25 243:2 methodology 60:21 methods 82:5 242:20 metric 225:9,10,13,20,23 244:21 micrograms 199:17,23 211:6 micronutrients 16:5,11 middle 64:17.24 midpoint 95:11 midway 89:24 102:24 203:8 miles 1:6 134:4 milligram 225:11 milligrams 100:25 101:9 142:25 143:13 144:9 199:14 199:18,21 225:6 248:12 **million** 101:1 199:19,20 200:15 201:23 206:25 207:9 207:15,20 208:1,8,11,12,21 209:14,20,23 238:23 mind 121:23 159:3 188:16 205:17 **Mine** 230:12 mined 190:10,14,18 mineral 16:6 mineralization 118:3 minimal 228:19 minimize 6:21 149:12 154:11 minimizing 149:1 minor 169:13 minute 13:9 41:15 63:3 69:16

72:9 91:23 172:1 180:5 200:25 209:19 211:24 224:14 237:1 mischaracterizes 84:15 misleading 144:23 **mission** 11:10 misspeak 24:21 misspoke 49:2 **mixed** 17:1 **mixture** 16:19,20,25 17:1 18:23 model 119:9,15 120:21 121:14 122:1,6,8,9,12,16,17 122:18,20,21 197:13,17,23 199:7 200:8,11,19,21 205:15,21 216:11 245:14 modeler 121:23 197:18 204:15 modelers 197:18 217:18,20 217:24 **modeling** 121:24 199:8 201:13 202:10 203:15 204:1 204:5 205:6.20.23 211:16 216:12 217:6 models 121:25 195:16,23 197:7,15 198:2 204:12,14 205:12 217:7 **modified** 156:23 220:15 moment 92:15 109:10 155:23 165:1 176:24 195:6 202:14 207:14 234:5 money 41:13 186:24,25 187:20 monitoring 136:12 months 240:20,21,22 241:19 241:23,25 242:3 **Moore** 58:21 59:6 moral 161:23 morally 161:19 **move** 9:17 27:5,9,10,11,15 43:2 54:5 66:25 73:12,14,17 74:21 91:3 123:19 127:22 129:10 150:7 189:9 190:16 190:18 232:9 moved 28:1 45:25 50:6 52:5

127:18 128:25 147:24 190:20,25 191:1,22 movement 67:1 85:17 128:17 moves 74:5,8 98:21 126:17 128:6 moving 27:23 28:14 50:1,14 50:23,25 51:2,19 52:10 73:5 73:8 83:23 126:2 131:13 146:11 188:3 189:12,19,21 190:2 221:25 mud 131:22,25 muddy 131:20,21 **multiple** 40:19 49:12 82:10 multiply 245:19,22 247:18 248:7 Multiplying 247:24 **M3P** 114:18 N **N** 2:1 3:1,3 17:7,11 63:2,9,17 109:12 113:7,8,9 154:11 168:3 name 5:5 48:14 73:20 92:21 107:20 136:25 152:20 226:22

named 253:9 names 9:9 136:25 Nance 2:3 3:5 4:7,7 5:4 11:21 13:12,15 16:23 25:7 41:7 44:19 48:4 57:22 62:9 67:17 71:7 84:18 95:8 106:13.16 123:1 139:21 207:23 213:21 239:2,11 250:25

145:22 152:8 194:15,18,24 national 153:11,17 **native** 66:21 67:13 68:22 **natural** 1:7 99:15 166:3 naturally 128:23 129:20 nature 56:11,13 166:9 near 66:5 137:20,23,23 138:5 138:15,21 142:4 148:7,9,12 nearer 138:11 nearly 142:21 nearness 139:5

near-stream 137:18 necessarily 16:1 38:24 131:25 174:9 215:20 need 7:18 15:13,23 20:3,3,8 20:10.23 21:8 22:15 23:20 23:23 29:19,22 33:12,19,20 33:24 42:15,21 43:7,8,19,22 44:15,17 47:6 62:20,20 67:15,18 97:12 99:21 110:6 113:18 115:20,21 117:14 137:9 151:23 169:1 184:23 205:2 206:15 223:15 243:21 **needed** 31:1 41:4,25 43:15 45:7 52:18 150:14 183:22 184:9 needs 15:6,10,18 20:15 21:16 22:6,13 32:25 33:7 43:3,10 45:14,15 52:5 63:17 64:3,19 65:3 113:17 183:4 244:17 **negligible** 37:5 43:13 226:18 226:22,23 227:13 negotiated 53:1 **neutral** 161:19 never 25:4 52:6 78:11 87:8 136:22 139:16 210:13 new 90:25 193:13 nine 154:21.22 155:3.5 nine-tenths 176:1 **nitrogen** 9:15 15:14,18,20,23 15:25 17:12,19 18:20,21 19:15,22 20:3,7,8,10,14,23 21:8,16 22:6,12 23:17,21,23 29:20,22 32:15,24 33:4,12 33:19,24 41:4,25 42:21 43:3 43:7,7,8,10,15,22,25 45:7,8 45:14,19 46:4,7,9 47:2 54:20,24 55:5,10,16 62:12 62:20,24 64:2,3,5,6 65:2 66:15 68:15 94:11 96:6,13 113:18,21,23 150:14 155:2 155:12,14 174:9 183:5,22 184:8,24

nitrogen-based 64:16

nonexistent 119:24

nitrogen-supplying 55:14

**normal** 57:16 64:15 87:22 **north** 2:20 17:3 **NORTHERN** 1:2 **Notary** 252:21 **note** 244:12 notes 253:12 **notice** 13:20 232:14 **notion** 26:10 **November** 7:20 8:8 **NO3** 154:13 NRCS 221:12 **number** 38:21 50:21 57:23 79:13,14,15 108:11 120:10 133:21 167:1 169:17 170:9 170:10 178:5 206:15 212:11 221:22 222:19 224:17 236:11 245:16 247:22 254:3 **numbered** 1:17 109:7 252:6 **numbers** 156:6,11 176:21 209:12 211:11 230:16 236:15,21 238:2 239:25 240:13 243:10 244:16 numerical 38:19,21,23 39:2 226:3,7 227:7 229:13 236:23 237:14 numerically 38:17,24 60:25 **nutrient** 6:11 8:21,22 11:12 14:24 15:1,7,8,9,11,22 33:20 46:18 47:5,7 53:12 54:15 62:13 88:8 95:17 161:12,16 183:25 184:18 188:19 218:22 221:2 **nutrients** 6:17,19,22 7:7 9:15 9:17,19 18:10 32:19 33:19 44:7 73:17 134:3,21 135:5,9 135:11 186:19 191:14 nutrition 71:23 **N-based** 155:9 **N-P** 109:11 155:7 **N.E** 2:6

### 0

O 2:23 object 20:24 21:21 22:9 23:12 24:16 27:22 28:7

30:21 31:11 33:13 34:1,15 35:16 36:15 37:1 40:18 41:8 42:3 43:4 44:9 46:12 47:16 48:6 50:3 51:14,20 53:23 54:7 67:14 68:5,18 72:14,21 73:2 74:2,16 75:20 76:16 77:1,3,7 79:3,5,25 80:3 81:19 83:9 84:14 85:22 86:3,7 88:11 107:4 110:18 120:15 124:3 128:19 130:18 134:23 143:19 144:22 145:4,20 146:23 149:15 150:6,25 154:15,17 158:9 159:2,8,11,21 160:18 161:2,6,13,21 162:4,7,23 164:2,6,12,19 169:22 170:18 182:9,23 183:9 190:5 193:16 250:4 **objection** 21:10 35:1 40:24 47:3 51:24 54:13 147:16,23 160:9 194:5,9,9,20 **observation** 140:24,25 142:8 **observed** 103:1 138:25 139:19 obtained 96:7 **obviously** 94:1 154:18 230:20 occasion 6:6 occur 169:4 230:25 occurred 82:22 occurring 128:23 129:20 175:6 offer 9:24 11:9 18:6 52:24 56:6 59:20,24 **offered** 10:13 40:7,10 43:21 134:24 159:12 193:17 194:10 offering 10:14 59:16 **office** 8:15 oftentimes 29:21 89:12 91:5 126:4 **oh** 18:3 100:3 101:8 136:18 156:12 163:18 165:24 211:2 237:8 246:20

**OK** 2:4,7,11,17

okay 6:3,6,14 7:9,12,21 8:5

9:7,12 13:10,20,24 14:10,19 15:4 16:16 17:18 18:5,8,14 20:2 21:11,23 22:1,5,21,25 24:10,24 27:15 28:25 29:24 31:8 32:11 33:9 34:12 35:14 37:23 38:3 39:7,14,15 40:13 41:2,11,14 42:4,8,17 43:1 45:11,17,25 46:8 51:8 55:3,22 56:1,5,8,19,25 57:7 57:20 60:9,12 61:7,14 62:5 62:7,25 65:7 66:15 69:24 70:4,14,18 71:21 72:9 73:10 73:20,22 74:13 75:4,10,13 75:24 76:24 77:5,9 81:1,11 81:14 83:19 85:25 86:14 87:2,12,16 88:8,15,19 89:19 89:22,22 90:1,13,20 91:10 91:17,23 92:7,14 93:17 94:1 94:9,20,23 95:10,20,24 96:2 96:24 98:2,10,13 99:4,17,23 100:5,21,23 101:2,7,15 102:2,16,20 103:12,15 104:16,25 105:23 106:7,12 107:6,16,20 108:1,20 109:6 109:22 110:11,15,22 111:6 111:16 112:7,23 113:5,10 113:24 114:14 115:15,23 116:1,9,23 117:23 119:4 120:20 121:16,20 122:25 124:8 125:9,11,25 127:10 127:24 128:4,9 129:20 130:11,23 131:2,6,10,21,25 134:13,14,19 135:21 136:14 136:20 137:3,8,13 138:1,13 139:9 140:14,20 141:5,25 143:9 144:3 146:2,22 147:2 147:14,23 148:4,11 149:18 149:24 150:3,21 152:4,19 152:23 153:1,11 154:5,8,20 155:7,21 156:18,21 157:5,9 157:19 158:20,25 159:18,23 163:21 165:1 166:14,15,19 166:24 167:3,14,22 168:1 168:10 169:3,9 171:17 172:7,9,10,13 173:7,15,19

Page 89 of 166

173:24 174:2,11 175:13,15 175:25 176:11,20,23 177:8 177:12,17,20 180:4,15,24 181:11,25 183:3,6,19 184:7 186:1,7,10 187:23 188:25 189:6,25 191:9 192:6,25 194:19,24 196:1,2,12,16,18 196:22 198:7,17 199:5,18 199:20,22,24 200:14,22 201:16 203:4,12 205:1,13 205:24 206:1,21,22 207:6 207:13,18 208:3,5,18,19 209:3,5,9,14,25 210:12 211:12 212:4,7,10,13,16 213:12,18 214:15,22 215:5 216:5,8 218:11,17 219:21 220:17,23 221:19 222:23 223:3,11,20,25 224:3,13,17 225:23 226:1,18,24 229:12 229:24 230:10 231:6,21,22 232:14 233:4,8,14,21 234:22 235:1,10,13 236:7 236:25 237:8,11,20 238:5 238:11,14,20 239:4,8,24 240:4,17 241:12,17 242:7 242:20 243:9,13,17,24 244:19 245:1,5,15,25 246:17,20 247:2,7,11,18,21 248:6,11,18 249:7,16,19 250:25 **Oklahoma** 1:2,5,6,8,19,22 2:7 4:8,10,11 47:6 86:12 88:20 101:6,12 161:15 171:21 172:9 184:15,22 206:22 220:18,21 221:3,6 221:12 238:24 239:1,3,7

2:7 4:8,10,11 47:6 86:12 88:20 101:6,12 161:15 171:21 172:9 184:15,22 206:22 220:18,21 221:3,6 221:12 238:24 239:1,3,7 248:14,17 250:16 253:3,8 Olsen 57:11,18 132:4 Olsen's 132:11 omitted 194:22 once 5:19 38:20,21 84:2 95:16 126:2 187:21 192:15 223:13,21 231:2,12,24 ones 39:25 48:17 108:16 one-fifth 247:14 **one-third** 167:14 on-campus 11:5 open 123:22 159:16 165:5 operating 192:4 **operation** 23:5 50:12 182:15 186:17 188:20 192:21,21 operations 49:15 70:15 147:5 167:8,10 188:1,11 189:1 191:18 192:13 193:2,3 opine 132:25 opinion 29:25 30:9 54:8 56:6 92:8 120:11 160:21 212:15 213:1 249:12 opinions 13:6 134:24 159:12 193:17 194:10 opportunity 212:24 **opposed** 138:11 oppressive 83:13 **optimum** 106:1 109:18 162:11 238:15,24 248:19,23 248:25 option 29:2,14 96:21 114:6 options 26:4,5,6 28:24 96:18 96:19 112:25 113:6 order 68:9 123:11 217:1 **ordered** 41:19 **orders** 42:18 organic 16:6 65:10,12 118:12 118:13 126:5 127:2 169:4 239:16,17 242:7,14 246:2 246:18,22 **organize** 235:3,8 oriented 203:1 **origin** 68:23 original 67:24 68:20 83:25 originally 58:4 84:5 190:19 originate 138:14 originated 76:14 82:23 83:18 84:5 **originates** 43:6 74:14 ought 171:7

outcome 35:21 37:4,8 151:4,8

**outlined** 82:14 128:20 178:12

220:10 243:23

**outlet** 126:7

178:21 **output** 36:19 37:12 38:17,23 39:8 153:7 **outputs** 181:6 outside 32:22,24 33:2,3 88:12 88:14 98:25 134:24 159:12 159:22 163:11 193:17 194:10 235:15 250:6 out-of-watershed 32:16 45:12 overall 19:24 35:18 40:1 157:22 158:4 169:3,9 170:17 171:14 188:1,9 197:1 **overcome** 185:7 187:25 Overcoming 179:23 overgeneralization 166:12 overland 123:21 **overlies** 132:19 overlooked 246:9 override 39:23,24 overriding 196:3 overview 6:9,10 99:7 211:16 overwhelm 39:18 owners 61:4 owns 45:18 182:17

#### P

**P** 2:1,1,23 3:3 17:7,7,14 30:25 31:1,2 39:19 56:14 63:8 65:9,10,12,13 85:9,15 85:16 87:4 89:9.13 90:3.14 90:24 91:7 94:17,25,25 95:15 96:10,18,20 97:3,6,9 100:16,19,24,25 101:18,20 102:25 103:2,17 105:4,6,14 105:19,25 107:1 108:10 109:12,16 110:2,3,19,21,25 111:11,11,16,21 112:4,5,7,9 113:7,9 114:3,8,18,20,20 115:8,8,8,12,13 116:17,20 116:24,25 117:8,9 118:2,2,4 118:15,23 119:5,14,17 120:12,12 123:11,14,15 127:17,20 128:4,24 131:5,6

131:8,11,12 133:8 138:24 141:8 142:17,22,24 143:11 143:14,14,15,18,22 144:4,9 144:10,11 145:18 146:3,8 146:11,20 147:3 148:6,7,11 148:14,18,21,22 151:7 153:6,12 155:10,17 156:3 157:6,20,22,23 158:4 162:13 166:2,10,22,25 167:10,14 168:2,4,13,19 169:4,5,10,14 173:7,13 174:20 175:6 180:6,16 185:15,20 191:15,16 192:10 193:3 195:18,19,19,25,25 197:5,7 199:13 201:8 202:8 202:25 203:9,12,17,17 205:3,8,8,14 208:7,10 209:14 210:22 211:5 214:1 214:2 215:5,9,14,15,18,21 215:22 216:7,13 220:5,13 220:19,21 223:22 227:2 235:7 237:2,4 238:23 239:13,14,16,17,22 242:9 246:9,14 247:6 248:1 package 58:9,12 page 3:7 14:13,15 16:16 22:22 54:18 56:8,8 63:1,12 65:7 69:9 85:10 87:2 89:25 93:7,8 95:11 96:24,24 99:17 99:18 101:15 102:23 103:12 104:25 105:24 109:6,22 111:6,7 114:15 117:12,19 117:20,21,22 123:9 132:3 132:10 133:21,22 135:21 137:8 142:14 153:3 155:21 155:22 156:18 164:20 165:5 166:14 168:13 169:10 171:17,18 177:12,12 180:2 195:7 196:23 198:24 205:25 211:3 212:17 218:2,15 220:18 222:24 249:9 252:1 254:3 pages 253:17 paid 51:3,3 79:13 86:25

panacea 26:3

**Pant** 110:5 paper 119:25 120:1 157:11 169:25 195:21,22 196:19,23 210:7 216:14 paperwork 187:17 paragraph 14:15 16:2,3 57:7 85:8 87:2 89:9,23 90:21 92:18 95:10 96:17,25 102:24 103:12 104:6 105:23 109:23 111:2 112:23,24 133:23 137:12 142:15 145:7 147:14,18,20,20,25 148:2 148:11 152:17 155:16 156:19 180:6 185:2 191:13 192:6 193:1,11 195:7,9 202:19 203:7,7 206:10 208:7,23,24 211:3 214:23 218:2,6 paragraphs 212:25 parameters 122:2 paraphrase 16:21 **Pardon** 13:9 parentheses 210:21 parenthesis 109:13 236:22 244:16 part 6:24 11:8 20:21 21:6 23:7 27:12,12 50:20 51:5,6 54:10,11 57:15 58:9,18 68:1 83:19 84:2 89:8,24 111:16 111:21 116:11 139:8 145:7 150:3,7 154:4 155:22 164:22 165:6,8,10 176:8 187:4 188:24 201:15 220:5 220:12 **partake** 204:18 participate 187:15 participated 92:15 **particles** 112:6 131:13 particular 15:7 18:2 78:2 126:10 132:21,24 139:10 204:18 219:15 224:6 235:7 particularly 62:16 65:20 66:20 143:12 144:8 particulate 75:11 131:6,7,12 131:14

**parties** 253:20 partition 197:23 partitioning 197:25 partly 145:2,2 parts 21:14 100:25 199:19,20 200:15,15 201:22,23 206:24 207:9,9,15,15,19,20 208:1,8 208:9,11,12,14,20 209:14 209:20,22,23 213:4 238:23 party 29:11 51:3,4 pasture 20:14,14 33:10,23 34:3 43:5,8,23 62:13,21,22 63:9 69:12 98:4 107:19 114:21 **pastureland** 60:15 61:3 102:8 **pastures** 24:13 54:20 63:2 102:6,17 166:3 pasture-grazed 55:7 62:16 path 125:1 pathway 123:17,20,22 124:2 124:9,17,20 129:13 pathways 123:14 166:4 169:6 patterns 148:6 pay 31:3 41:12,19 42:19 52:6 53:2 144:16 193:12,15 194:4 **peatv** 169:4 **Peninsula** 6:7,16,24 7:2,24 8:3 **Penn** 143:3 156:8 237:17 **Pennsylvania** 135:15 143:5 223:6,13 227:2 228:11 233:18 **people** 9:9 20:22 21:7 26:14 26:17 27:4,5,8 56:17 57:3 60:5 95:2 134:7 160:16 187:15 197:18 243:6 250:12 250:14 **people's** 244:18 peppermint 133:18 **perceive** 180:20 **percent** 72:5 80:9 103:19,19 103:21 104:4 134:3,4 142:21 143:7,12 144:5,8 166:2,6,11,22 168:2 169:15

169:17,20,21 170:5,13 171:15 178:5,9,19 197:21 197:22 percentage 50:21 68:21 132:16 167:21 percentages 60:4 **percolation** 132:20 133:1 **period** 103:3,17 176:7 224:10 224:14 230:10,17,20 231:2 234:4,6,19 235:4 244:10,13 245:5,13,15,20 249:13 permits 55:6 personal 50:7,9 142:7 personally 22:1 31:21,24 47:10 222:3 **personnel** 11:14,14 **perspective** 49:21 138:23 170:5,21 178:14 **perspectives** 105:1 149:19 pertinent 10:7 208:7 213:4 pervasive 155:3 **Peterson** 2:15 4:12 **pH** 127:1 129:17,23 130:3,8 **phase** 71:22 **phases** 118:11 126:25 **PhD** 1:15 3:4 4:24 48:9 252:3 252:12 254:1 **phone** 2:24 4:19 8:10 **phosphate** 190:14,24 **phosphoric** 56:23 57:4 **phosphorus** 9:15 10:16,16,24 11:3,16 12:12,16 17:14,20 17:20 18:20,21 19:15,22 20:4,12,16,17,18,23 21:9,17 22:7,14 23:18,21,24 29:20 29:22 30:11,17 31:16 32:15 32:25 33:5,12,20,25 35:7,17 35:20,22 36:3,17,24 37:3,4 37:6,7,8,13 38:8,15,17 39:1 39:16 41:4,25 42:22,25 43:3 43:11,13 44:3,15,17 45:14 45:23 46:1,2,9,20 47:2 49:4 54:1,12 56:10,13,24 57:4,5 59:17 62:21,24 64:19 65:25 66:1,4,8,11,19,23,24,25

67:10,24,25 68:7,10,10,11 68:13,16,21,22,23 69:1,11 69:17,24 70:2,5,6 71:4,17 72:3,10,18 73:5,7,25 74:7 74:11,13 75:7,9,11,24 76:4 76:7,8,14,21,23,25 77:13,17 77:20 78:8 81:12,17,21,23 82:3,6,10,16,21 83:6,17,19 83:20,20,24 84:1,2,5,8,11 85:4,12 87:13 88:1,2,5,6,8 89:13,16,20,20 90:25 91:18 93:13,23 97:15,15,17,21 98:8,11,12,14,19,22,22,24 99:6,20 103:11 105:11,12 105:16 108:10,23 109:2 110:10 111:19,25 112:3,5 112:20 113:14,20,22 114:1 114:5 118:8,9,12,16,19,20 118:22 119:1 120:6 121:6 123:19 124:2 125:20,22 126:3,17,19,19 128:6,18 129:4,5,7,14 130:1,16 131:15 135:11,13 137:11 138:14,19,20 139:4 143:16 146:14 149:2,8,14 150:1,17 150:23 151:3,12,15,20 155:4,12 156:16 157:13 158:5,12,17,19 159:10 162:2,14,22,25 163:6,8,13 163:19,22,25 164:11 167:8 168:1,10 169:2,11 172:3,7,8 172:23 173:5,21 174:3,10 174:11,12 176:9 179:8 180:15,21 181:5,6,17 183:5 183:21 184:8,12,24 185:21 190:6,7,7,9 191:3 197:2,4 199:15 216:2,18,19 217:1 218:20,21 219:2,3,11,17,17 219:19,21,25 220:23 221:19 222:4,17 223:3,5,7 224:6 236:5 237:25 238:22 239:23 241:8 242:15,16 247:21 248:10 249:8 250:2,9,17,18 phosphorus-based 63:24 64:18 179:24

**phrase** 155:1 phrases 121:1 phtyoremediating 113:16 **physical** 78:20 100:6 121:2 124:25 128:12,16 130:14 131:8,11,12 185:21 **physically** 83:22 118:10 phytoremediation 91:11,18 101:23 106:25 113:14 120:14 phytoremediation-type 107:15 **PI** 14:8 58:11 156:23 184:20 228:6 243:25 245:14 pick 118:22 201:14 **picking** 115:3 177:7 **picks** 166:7 **pictures** 168:16 **piece** 115:18 117:4 124:8 219:2 **pieces** 145:22 188:8 **piles** 117:16 pipeline 151:11 **place** 18:21,21,22 25:20 27:6 34:24 36:13,25 100:9 106:13 122:13 126:6 147:12 150:20 182:21 183:4 190:8 240:17 251:1 253:18 **placed** 241:7 placement 245:8 **places** 90:23 183:21 228:3 235:11 **Plaintiff** 1:9,16 **PLAINTIFFS** 2:3 **Plaintiff's** 13:8 14:10 57:21 **plan** 28:11 46:18 47:5,7 85:6 183:25 184:1,2 **planned** 250:24 **planning** 191:17 218:22 220:6 **plans** 27:2,9 **plant** 14:24 20:3 66:6 67:24 68:22 71:18 113:8 **planted** 241:14 242:1 planter 240:18 241:7

**planting** 116:11 positive 115:7,11 49:15 71:12 72:4 97:7 plants 14:25 15:13 55:1 positively 116:25 117:8 111:24 139:15,19 149:9 68:11 69:12 83:21 91:14 **possible** 30:16 72:22,24 150:8 186:2 187:2 98:17 113:16 118:21 119:2 110:20 113:15 114:4 179:18 practices 31:20 186:3 203:14 180:16 195:12 204:16 205:5 220:3.14 242:5 precise 211:15,18,21 212:5 **plant-available** 54:20 64:2 possibly 186:19,22 plausible 30:19 212:10 pot 197:21,22,22 **play** 194:8 potassium 17:16,21 18:19,20 precisely 204:18 **played** 129:15 19:23 96:6,14 precision 212:14 **playing** 194:7,12 **potential** 15:7,9 34:2 37:9 preclude 51:17 **Plaza** 2:23 39:15 45:13 85:17,19 87:4 **predict** 122:21 202:7 214:2 **please** 4:6 5:6 21:4 39:13 112:9 132:21 133:8 138:24 **predicted** 35:22 108:18 122:8 122:11,15 215:14 67:19 69:4 91:13 94:24 143:21,24 144:12 148:14,17 97:12 111:14,15 114:25 148:18,22 149:7 202:24 predicting 205:14 135:17 140:12 195:11 219:18,20 221:21,25 227:16 **prediction** 104:10 195:23 207:8,11 210:20 217:16 212:20 223:19 229:4,5 **plenty** 204:24 216:17 potentially 70:1,3,7 72:22,23 predictive 122:21 **plot** 137:16 178:24,25 201:3 96:14 124:12 predictor 88:5 **plowed** 241:15 **poultry** 11:17,23 16:18 17:19 predicts 122:20 **plug** 67:18 18:10,12,17 21:13 28:18,19 **preface** 87:19 **plugged** 244:20 33:10,21,22 44:7 50:1,10,13 **prefer** 24:19 **plugging** 207:19 50:20 52:2 53:1 54:19 55:3 preferential 169:6 **Plus** 159:21 57:9,16 63:14,18 69:21 70:2 prehistoric 190:11 point 10:23 15:16 24:8 28:15 70:9 71:3,6,7,10,23 72:11 preliminary 5:19,20 10:10,21 29:13 33:16 52:5,5 83:15 72:12 73:13 74:14,22 75:19 12:5,9,25 88:2 119:21 121:12 124:13 79:2,9 85:4 87:9,17 89:20 **premise** 76:19 121:14 220:25 **preparation** 12:4 59:13 86:9 124:24 125:2 152:5 161:23 94:5 98:5 154:1 160:8 162:13 166:4,13 167:24 166:2 167:8,10,15 172:3 86:10 169:25 170:12 183:15 179:24 180:8,11,11,17 **prepare** 10:20 132:25 189:14 196:3 197:14 202:2 181:4 182:17 185:6 187:25 **prepared** 13:3 72:24 124:6 202:4,6 207:25 208:6 217:4 188:1,11,25 191:18,22 135:1 217:10 218:20 228:20 192:12,19,21 193:2 221:2 presence 8:1,2 pointing 211:1 **pound** 73:12 84:6 90:5 **present** 9:9 219:19 points 198:15 228:9 121:10 221:6 presentation 121:9 **pounds** 19:22 73:14,14,18 **policy** 53:5 56:17 193:19,22 **presented** 14:21 57:11,13 193:24 245:9 84:7,7 90:6 101:3,5,13 119:15 157:11 209:1 210:3 political 193:24 119:19 120:9 121:7 169:13 210:7 212:5 227:1 252:4 206:16,23 226:1 238:25 **pool** 83:19,21 84:3 118:8,9 presenting 210:9 presumably 176:10 232:6 **pools** 118:18 120:6 240:8 248:14,16 249:3 population 11:15 **PowerPoint** 58:4,7,13 59:12 234:8 porosity 132:18 **PPB** 210:22 **presume** 8:16 115:6 173:18 **portion** 101:16 102:16 **PPM** 210:21 174:14 237:16 157:11 246:25 practical 24:7 49:16 96:18,21 **presumption** 216:10 243:5 **portions** 149:5 150:17 practically 119:24 pretreatment 109:1 position 26:4 60:24 **practice** 29:15 31:15 47:9 **pretty** 25:7 28:16 54:23

223:10 238:9 **previous** 67:21 117:19 previously 96:7 115:5 148:5 197:17 primarily 137:17 **primary** 20:7 53:13 54:19 principle 181:20 principles 10:24 **printed** 58:6 225:1 **prior** 5:24 7:24 **proactive** 114:22 116:14 probability 15:24 **probably** 7:17 10:3,6 59:4,15 64:6 66:17 71:13 86:21 89:5 105:24 110:13 112:2 113:21 134:8 143:3 154:22 162:9 166:7 171:8 174:8 178:13 179:1,1,2 183:16 189:4 196:15 205:12 237:17 **problem** 6:23 7:1 20:21 21:6 25:14 48:2 134:1,9 140:12 157:14 159:4.6.9.18 160:5 162:2,6 177:23 180:20 181:16 210:9,16 procedure 84:3 **proceedings** 44:25 84:23 106:21 152:12 195:3 234:1 252:6 **process** 84:4 116:11 127:4,7 150:9,12 182:20,24 212:14 218:22 220:6 **processes** 126:20 127:9 **produce** 6:19 153:7 193:14 **produced** 1:15 23:5 42:24 43:18 88:23 89:2 90:22 97:2 153:20 190:9 192:17 producer 45:5 46:1 113:6 producers 60:1,4 192:11 **producing** 46:6,15,17 60:22 108:8 138:25 148:12 192:2 **product** 18:11 19:1,4 28:19 44:8 245:22 **production** 4:18 6:13,15,19 6:25 9:16 16:4 30:14,15 31:14 55:6 62:17 71:10

93:21 95:12 100:9 105:5 109:4,4 150:8 154:10 157:16 180:11 187:25 188:4 189:13,20 191:22,24 192:16 192:19 **productivity** 20:15 63:10 64:3,4 **products** 180:17 **profess** 232:12 **profession** 21:19 49:24 51:8 51:23,25 52:4,8 53:7,12 54:14,15 75:15 134:8 140:20 151:12 **professional** 22:8,10,16 26:9 29:24 31:25 160:21 183:1 228:17 229:7 243:7,19 professionally 49:4 50:6 52:14 59:3 163:2 179:15 professionals 26:25 profession's 54:11 **professor** 5:9 58:25 **profit** 188:18 **profitability** 188:15 194:2 profusely 66:7 program 29:8 50:16,16 51:5 187:9 **programs** 187:7,12,13 **progress** 130:16 progression 234:14 projected 218:23 **promise** 223:12 238:20 promising 156:7 **prone** 24:5 126:24 241:11 proneness 24:5 **pronounce** 92:21 152:20 222:20 pronounced 58:24 **properly** 162:25 213:2,7 properties 157:7 **property** 27:14 28:9 29:1 42:11,13,15 43:15 55:12,18 151:9 181:18 proportion 169:13 **proposal** 163:24 164:4,9,15 193:14

**proposed** 56:3 156:23 164:13 165:25 proposing 189:18 **proposition** 21:18 72:18 169:15 228:6 **protect** 27:24 protective 186:21 **protocol** 132:7 179:15,16,17 179:20 **proves** 28:12 **provide** 180:12 183:1 provided 58:18 provides 157:5 proximity 7:11 **pseudo** 170:3 **public** 11:10,10 171:6 193:13 193:15,19,22 252:21 **publication** 12:19 107:18 134:15 207:8 210:21 222:11 226:22 **publications** 12:20 195:20 publicly 171:4 published 94:15 117:3,7 213:25 pull 97:17,20 **pulled** 198:20 purchase 33:4 43:25 96:13,15 154:12 **purchased** 55:21 64:6 **purchasing** 55:13 96:5 **Purdue** 58:25 59:8 **pure** 120:22 **purpose** 11:1 36:7 97:17 136:12 195:16,22 196:11 198:1 203:25,25 204:5,11 205:11 purposefully 129:2 **purposely** 191:22,25 **purposes** 35:6 36:9 179:8 195:22 196:14 199:8 200:19 200:21 205:23 217:5 218:13 240:7 **put** 18:20 21:18 29:19 34:12 36:25 45:19,22 59:15 66:3,8 68:6 88:20 98:17 113:25

117:13 129:13 143:16 161:22 121:6,8,10,15,17 122:4 147:12 170:4 178:14 182:22 quick 44:20 67:17 123:1 168:12,18 188:17 221:23 quickly 87:25 91:2 106:11 239:13,17,22 242:7,10,25 184:23 194:20 195:21 213:14 216:6,25 247:13 114:2,4 115:3 118:14 243:1 **putting** 46:22 47:1 68:7 quite 108:7 136:18 178:10 rates 63:3,15 93:24 94:10 110:16 114:11 149:13 239:11 108:13,18 109:2 243:2 **quo** 43:17 **puzzled** 28:16 rating 39:2 40:3 223:22 **P-based** 63:15,23 64:24 96:3 quote 64:15 95:6 237:10 244:3,8,10,19,24 96:3 246:1 249:9,11 R **P-enriched** 93:14 104:11 ratings 245:5 R 2:1 253:1 ratio 19:15 62:19 109:11,12 105:6 radical 128:22 129:22 130:3 **P-management** 142:17 148:8 155:7 130:7 **p.m** 106:19,20,21,23 123:4,8 rationale 236:14 radically 129:4,24 152:10,11,12,14 195:1,2,3,5 **reach** 64:3,4 85:25 86:5 rain 76:25 77:14 81:2,4 233:24,25 234:1,3 251:3,5 124:13 196:7 112:20 138:5 230:24 231:7 **P205** 90:6 reached 138:7 231:10 233:9 reaches 74:10 85:23 125:3 Q **rained** 138:1 126:6 qualified 16:10 rainfall 74:5 77:9,15 80:13,14 reaching 112:13 83:7 132:21 168:21 178:23 qualitative 248:2 reactive 114:18 115:8,12 quality 6:13,15,23 7:1,8,15 178:24 179:5 231:4 199:15 27:25 28:3 88:21 134:2,5 rainfalls 77:18 **read** 14:19 15:1 17:6,8 18:12 159:15 171:11 197:6,15 rains 75:5 76:1,9 80:23,25 67:20 79:18 88:25 93:10,18 237:1 127:10 141:12 215:25 94:23 95:17 97:11 103:5 quantification 227:7 rainstorm 231:23 105:7 107:5,7,11 108:21 quantifies 185:15 raise 31:15 90:5 109:9,23 111:7 113:3 quantitative 73:18 229:10 raised 32:2 79:16 153:22 115:21 116:7 133:23 134:5 230:3 ramifications 34:2 53:16.17 143:10 144:1 147:8,19 quantitatively 73:5,9,11 ran 125:13 148:1 149:21 157:16,24 119:11 194:13 226:25 ranchers 63:16 158:13,14 161:18 171:4 **quantities** 16:5 54:25 ranching 182:15 174:24 180:25 185:12,13,13 quantity 14:24 15:6.10.23 range 20:1 156:16 170:8 185:17 200:24 205:2,2 20:8 73:21 88:3,4 215:9 179:2 203:18 205:9 206:19 208:4 229:24,25 ranged 103:19 **readership** 171:10,12 **question** 8:14 21:1,3,4,18 **ranges** 168:2 **readily** 55:4 249:16 24:17 31:13 33:17 35:6 rapid 153:4 168:3 **reading** 103:25 142:19 36:8,8,9 41:16,17,18 42:7 **rapidly** 94:17 113:15 147:17 173:19 181:1 189:19 42:17 47:25 59:17 67:19,21 **rarely** 161:7 203:5 204:6 225:4,14 rate 30:25 33:7 38:14,18 68:20,24 74:3 82:12,20 83:3 ready 13:1,25 152:6 83:10,12 98:3 99:25 107:14 55:14 63:21,23,24 64:1,16 real 29:15 37:24 40:6 50:15 131:7 137:7 141:4 143:25 64:17,18,24 65:1,1,4 67:1 86:6 115:3 122:9 182:19 89:15 90:19,24 91:4,5,8 146:15 157:2 158:10 159:14 183:7 198:15 204:8 210:24 160:4,4 161:8 165:9 192:8 92:12 100:14,15,15 108:10 213:10,10 226:16 235:22 193:19 194:1 197:13 110:9,9 118:4,5,17 119:5,12 realignment 191:18 questions 9:12,24 24:25 119:16,16,20,22 120:3,8 realistic 185:17

realize 37:14 130:24 **realized** 107:13 really 9:23 31:12 37:10 39:19 52:14 65:15 74:20 91:1 98:9 126:9 127:13.16 135:1 136:25 150:3 167:21 187:12 188:12,21,22 191:20 192:2 193:19,25 229:1 245:12 realtime 209:4 reason 43:21 54:19 65:4 134:19 reasonable 25:20 73:23 90:10 90:12 112:15 139:14 reasons 186:5,7 recall 52:11 58:14,15 80:8,8,9 88:23 89:2 107:23 136:12 177:6 198:22 200:21 203:5 204:6 222:14 receive 60:14 184:16 received 212:23 receiving 46:8,16,17,18,23,24 47:1,4 78:6,16 183:23 184:3 184:4.12.14.20 196:7 recess 44:24 84:22 106:20 152:11 195:2 233:25 recessed 251:4 recognition 148:6 recognize 133:14 152:16 214:16 240:12 **recollection** 48:17 57:13 108:5 135:16 230:22 recommend 26:5 recommendation 22:15 37:12 45:24 46:13 143:4 145:9 237:18 250:8 recommendations 21:15 22:11 64:13 156:9,14 183:1 recommended 52:9 **recommending** 22:12 147:3 **Record** 4:3,6 41:16 44:22,25 45:2 62:11 84:20,23,25 106:18,21,22 123:3,6,7 147:18,25 148:2 152:9,12 152:13 185:14 194:20,25 195:3,4 218:13 233:23

234:1,2 251:2 recreate 190:14 recycled 69:12,18 102:12,14 191:4 **recycling** 98:13 99:2 red 187:8,17 redeposited 97:22 redistributed 99:9 reduce 91:15 95:15 97:15 105:25 106:5 110:19 113:13 149:7 150:16 157:21 164:10 164:18 205:18 220:4,16 reduced 64:1,25 65:1,4 110:3 253:13 reducing 96:18,20 149:2,4 193:3 reduction 107:1 reductions 102:25 105:19 Reed 120:1 refer 223:25 reference 23:3 31:13 98:9 116:5 167:17.20 231:18 referenced 57:12 95:2 111:4 111:5 117:3 119:25 133:15 156:25 177:17 208:23 210:17 212:25 **references** 111:13 117:2 119:22 134:15 153:8,22 168:22 referencing 115:5,10,18 referred 92:18 107:11,18 **referring** 146:25 160:13 187:14 192:15 211:2 226:7 **refers** 116:5 215:13,13 **refined** 151:24 **reflect** 173:16 **reflected** 105:4,14 **regard** 21:16 136:6 164:14 194:21 243:23 regarding 18:9 28:17 44:6 47:9 188:19 regardless 83:18 regards 23:17 88:10 **regimes** 184:21 regionally 153:20

regions 93:21 138:10,11 191:22,23,23,25 192:1 223:7 regression 198:13,21,23,24 210:3.10 regulates 118:19,22 regulation 96:16 regulations 47:8 63:13 64:7 64:11 96:11 regulators 134:13 regulatory 26:18 50:9 185:5 reiteration 205:17 relate 195:25 236:22 **related** 195:18 **relates** 200:10 **relating** 203:16 205:7 relation 7:10 **relationship** 6:14 9:2 188:20 197:5 198:14,21 201:6 211:5,8,9 215:4,8,14,21 216:13,18 240:14 relative 14:24 35:20,21 70:21 161:3 170:1.5.21 178:14 220:10 234:20 253:20 relatively 54:25 218:25 219:1 219:1 227:15 **release** 202:25 released 197:7 releases 118:14 **reliable** 91:9 120:10 reliance 177:1.10.24 relied 92:7 relocate 98:19 rely 167:20,22 169:16 remain 43:17 110:3 205:15 remainder 167:15 **remains** 185:7 remedial 185:4 186:13 187:8 remediate 97:15 104:10 112:25 113:6 **remediating** 114:2 118:21 remediation 97:7 110:2,9,11 110:24 remedy 110:12,13,15,17 remember 8:25 9:9 10:22

13:15 20:2 45:9 48:14 52:13 58:8 63:4 87:3 157:10 177:7 178:17 197:14 220:6 **remote** 110:1 removal 107:18 110:25 114:7 118:4 168:1 remove 96:22 97:24 102:2 105:6 110:7,8 removed 99:5 101:18,19 102:18 103:10 105:13 158:17 182:3 render 54:8 **repeat** 21:4 67:19 replace 45:7 report 13:3 14:22,23 56:20 85:8 88:12 89:4,8 90:7 92:19,25 93:8 94:2 96:25 107:12 117:10 119:11,15 134:25 152:17,24 159:13 164:20,24 165:2,6,22 167:6 176:24 177:4,9,13,14,18 178:8.12.22 193:18 194:11 195:7 196:16 198:20,20 199:4 205:24 206:6,12,13 207:22,25 208:4 211:2 212:24 213:5,16,19 218:3,7 250:6 reported 58:10 253:11 reporter 1:20 67:18,20 117:15 253:7 Reporter's 3:7 reporting 171:20 reports 32:1 88:20,22 163:13 177:24 178:3 **represent** 9:10 174:12 representation 166:8 representatives 11:17,23 **represented** 77:6 198:23 representing 169:13 represents 219:14 **require** 184:22 required 14:25 54:24 62:13 95:14 109:17 requirements 94:11 96:7

154:11 155:2 184:16 187:9 requires 155:11 reread 111:14 research 31:25 136:18 163:18 185:11.14 186:10 213:25 216:17 221:14,16 researchers 53:4 resistant 118:15 resolved 218:25 resource 192:10 resources 1:7 186:12,21 respect 36:10 38:4 respective 247:19 **respond** 161:24 response 142:24 156:5 228:16,18 responsibility 51:13 54:4 180:13 **responsible** 50:1 52:9 responsive 156:16 rest 239:25 restrict 147:4,13 restriction 39:5 **restrictions** 24:22 25:12 33:11,23 34:10,22 35:11 42:20 60:15 61:3,16 result 16:6 40:3 93:23 143:14 144:10,10,12 145:17,18 163:17 174:8 176:14 resulted 22:14 resulting 146:4 results 86:18 91:25 92:1 101:16 104:16 114:16 115:4 155:10 163:5,8,22 171:20 resume 114:22 **resuming** 116:14 retained 102:14 124:14 return 188:18 224:10,14 230:10,17 231:2 233:13 234:4,4,19 235:4 244:10,13 245:5,13,15,20 249:13 returned 190:7 returns 69:18 114:8 reversible 168:4 reversing 190:15

**review** 57:10 reviewed 5:23 10:23 13:5 60:20 88:19,22 160:15 rewind 154:21 rhetorical 192:7 **rhyme** 218:17 **rich** 191:16 **right** 5:21 7:3 18:12 20:16 25:3,10 38:6 41:1 42:4,10 45:14,16,23 46:5 54:21 55:7 56:21,23 57:19 61:9 63:10 68:4,11 69:19 70:8 71:8 74:23 75:19 76:5,11,12,15 76:18 77:19 81:12 87:10,14 93:3,4 94:12,19,21 95:3,4 101:11 107:2 111:4,20 113:1 115:19 116:4 117:5 128:11 130:15 131:1 132:6 134:16 135:15,24 138:3,22 139:6 141:7,10 143:6 144:14 145:2,15 146:22 147:1 152:24.25 154:25 158:24 160:23,24 167:12 168:6 172:12,15,19,20 173:2,8,13 174:4,16,22 175:10,18,23,24 176:2,23 179:9,25 189:5,19 190:22 192:23 197:12 198:4,9,11 200:2,4,6,7 202:14 204:22 204:25 206:8,11 207:4,11 207:12,13,17 209:4,13,15 210:1,2,4,18,23 211:7,25 212:8 214:5 216:21,24 218:7 220:20 221:13 222:15 224:18 225:7 226:2,10 227:5,18 228:8 229:18 230:18,19 231:14 232:8,16 232:18,20 235:1 237:11,13 237:22 238:24 239:8,11 240:12,25 241:2 242:8,20 244:6,11 246:2,10,12,15 247:4,13,20 250:20 **right-hand** 101:9 109:9,23 137:10 153:3 167:6 173:12 173:12 198:25 202:16

risk 34:18 35:20,21,23 36:16 37:9 38:15,19,23,25 39:15 40:15 43:13 44:3 96:10 117:1 149:2,4 150:8,16 151:10 154:12 155:17 218:4 219:1 220:1,10,13,16 221:21 232:3 233:7 234:20 236:18,20 240:25 241:6,21 241:24,24 242:8 243:21 riskier 234:23 242:15 riskiest 242:2 risky 241:2 245:7 river 16:9,12,14 21:24 22:2 30:1,7 47:11,14 55:23 60:2 60:6,13 61:2,15 67:5,11 70:9,10 72:7,11,13,20 73:1 73:6 74:1,23 75:17 77:2,10 77:21,21,25 78:25 79:10 80:11,17,22,24 81:9,18 85:5 88:9,21 90:11 92:4 94:5 99:4 102:7,17 120:13 124:1 124:19 126:14 127:24 130:2 134:4,20 136:17,21,24 137:5 140:16 142:8 154:2 159:7,10,15,19 160:6 161:16 162:3,8,16,20 163:7 184:15 232:22 250:3,10,19 road 182:5,14 **Robert** 2:3,22 **robustly** 113:17,19 rock 66:23 190:14,24 rockiness 24:5 **Roger** 57:10 role 11:8 26:12 53:14 134:9 194:3,7,8,12 **room** 139:25 **root** 65:8,12 66:1,6,7 110:13 **rooting** 65:23 98:15 **roots** 66:5,9 98:16,20 roster 12:2 rough 204:2 roughly 19:25 100:22 119:18 row 105:2 241:4,5,16 247:3,5 247:16 rows 247:1

**rule** 20:12,13 31:9 101:4 141:11 194:21 240:9 **rules** 47:8 run 50:16 76:13 124:24 125:12 141:3 212:24 220:8 227:10 245:17 running 198:2 200:19 runoff 69:13,25 75:6,8,9,11 76:1,17,20,22 77:17,18,20 78:2,6,9,10,16 82:22 83:24 84:8 85:17,19,23,25 86:5 93:13 95:1 112:9,12 114:18 114:20 116:25 117:9 124:21 125:1,2,15,16,19 127:14,15 129:25 132:5,8,20 136:10 137:11,16,17,21,22 138:8,9 138:14,17,20,21,25 141:3,6 141:13,13 143:15 144:11,17 145:18 146:4,7,8,9,16,16,16 146:19 148:12 149:2,3,6,8,8 149:13 150:19 166:4,9,22 166:25 168:11 169:2 195:19 195:25 196:5,5,6 197:8 199:15 201:7,7,8,17 202:4,8 202:25 203:13,17 205:5,8 205:14 207:10 208:7 210:22 211:5 214:25 215:1,5,18,21 216:19 217:13 224:10,16 226:18,23,23 227:7,10,12 227:16,21,22,22,22 228:4 229:14,20,22 230:24,25 231:5,24 233:3,10 241:11 244:8,14 245:1,20 runs 77:13 **rushed** 116:3 **Ruston** 172:9

#### S

S 2:1 3:3,3 sacrifice 205:21 sacrificing 205:15 sample 178:25 202:3 216:15 sampled 206:17 samples 57:16 114:18 sampling 86:19,20,21 **sand** 132:16 Sanders 2:22 4:20,20 sandy 169:4 172:9 sat 14:2 **satisfied** 6:1 115:24 196:12 197:12 satisfy 32:23 33:18 158:13 206:19 saturated 137:25 saturation 197:6 saw 121:9 122:9 222:11 saying 15:13,24 28:23 34:7 44:11 57:8 84:6 97:13 113:20 121:11 135:19 143:15,20 146:2 148:20 150:11 151:23 158:3 171:8 171:13 179:11 189:21 197:15 202:2 203:24 204:3 204:6 205:11,20 215:4 227:10 231:22 237:5,9 savs 17:5 41:12 56:19 64:17 65:8 90:13 93:17 94:16 96:17 101:17.24 104:5 105:18,20 110:23 111:21 112:7 114:15,16 115:15 116:9,23 119:4 137:10,14 137:21 138:22 142:16,21 143:9 144:12,14,16 145:16 147:2 148:16 150:12 169:21 172:2,14 173:14 185:14 197:1 198:10 201:20 206:15 213:23 217:11 224:22 231:16 232:17 243:25 244:12 scale 137:16 157:21,24 158:4 158:8 170:1 180:25 181:1,2 181:20 193:6 227:15 229:6 236:20 247:9 249:1,1 scales 170:22 188:5 191:10 193:4 238:3 scenario 25:19 26:2 30:16 37:10 40:25 41:9,11 43:21 44:1,11,17 46:6 50:5 64:24 64:25 102:10 128:20 141:17

150:22 178:13 179:3 184:4

220:7,7,8 142:19 143:24 144:1 146:11 scenarios 62:1 63:15 108:12 152:1 153:1 165:5,17 167:5 125:16 203:19 205:10 167:8 171:18 172:1,4 177:8 213:10 228:15 195:17 198:18 202:20 scheduled 47:19 203:10 204:6 224:4 230:7 scheme 42:12 247:8 230:14,16 232:19 235:10 scholars 48:9 236:5 239:25 242:10 243:25 science 5:13 81:25 150:12 244:2 247:15 214:7 227:18 229:12 243:9 seemingly 160:12 243:11 seen 22:2 37:2,6 75:22 80:17 scientific 73:23 161:23 214:3 81:8,15 87:1 99:24 140:19 214:13 221:9,13 226:11 160:15,19,25 166:20 221:13 221:16 222:5,7,9 223:1,2,13 227:5.20 **scientifically** 72:17 84:9,16 **seep** 126:7 90:10 144:21 145:19 235:3 segmented 227:24 segments 27:1 226:13 235:12 scientist 5:12 49:21 53:12 **self-defeating** 113:25 114:1 72:24 sense 12:7 29:18 32:14 49:22 scientists 26:25 53:4,19 54:15 111:21 190:16 210:11 134:12 sensitive 36:21 **scope** 88:12 98:9 134:24 sent 89:3 159:12,22 193:17 194:10 sentence 14:18,20 15:4 16:3 198:6 250:6 17:6 18:8,14 65:8 69:6 **score** 236:24 247:10 89:25 93:10,18 94:15,23 **scoring** 236:23 96:2,8,17 97:1,10 101:17 **Scott** 2:15 4:12 57:23 103:16 104:6 105:2,18 **scrutiny** 184:5,7 109:10.24 111:8 112:7.12 **SEAL** 253:22 115:3 116:23 117:2,3 118:7 second 16:3 65:8 67:16 77:15 119:4 123:11 133:24 134:16 92:24 95:10 100:7 103:16 137:14 138:22 142:16,21 111:21 114:6 123:11 127:11 143:10,24 144:1,21,24 127:12 133:7 135:17 142:16 145:6 147:2,7,8 149:18 165:24 172:21 177:16 180:5 153:11,19 154:8 155:7,16 192:25 193:1 194:16 218:6 156:24 157:5 158:3 169:3,9 secondary 93:5 170:17 180:15 185:14 seconds 140:4 186:10,14 192:25 193:1 **SECRETARY** 1:6 197:11 202:19 203:6,9 section 14:21 27:3 164:20,21 205:2,13 sentences 105:23 158:11 165:11 180:3 193:11 200:24 203:8 205:24 213:15 230:16 181:11 185:10 186:14 sections 194:21 228:21,21 separate 17:19 18:1 122:10 see 7:22 9:1 15:12 32:7 40:8 224:15 233:11 63:18 69:7,10,14 85:10 87:6 separated 17:7,8 101:8 105:13 107:10 122:7 sequence 30:14 122:12 131:17 135:17 **SERA-17** 212:21

series 221:24 seriously 162:21 served 43:14 97:20 sessions 12:22 set 45:16 124:24 142:17 172:12 sets 239:12 seven 116:6 155:9 seventeen 204:22 severely 39:15 **shallow** 66:10,12,16 98:15 126:6,11 shallowness 24:4 **Sharpley** 48:19,25 49:6 94:19 117:4 152:23 165:17 166:7 167:23 169:20,24 170:16 171:13 177:14 178:5,9,16 179:6 203:22 **Sharpley's** 177:1,17 179:22 **Sheri** 167:23 **She'll** 117:15 **shift** 129:23 **ship** 29:11 **shipping 55**:19 **shore** 71:10 **short** 15:17 44:24 84:22 86:9 152:11 195:2 233:25 **Shorthand** 1:20 253:7 **show** 46:20 57:20 77:8 100:2 107:9 116:24 118:23 119:22 139:14 165:13,16 206:9 214:15 219:25 **showed** 115:6 213:15,17 **shown** 167:11 203:15 205:6 211:8 216:22 **shows** 76:24 80:1 90:23 166:22 174:2,3 211:4 216:17 side 33:2 98:2 139:24 140:2 172:11 173:13 202:16 247:13 Sidley 8:15,17,19 Sigma 245:23 sign 252:7 **Signature** 3:7 252:1

**significance** 57:7 59:12 **significant** 102:25 114:16 115:4,16 **silage** 150:15 silt 132:16 137:1 **silty** 137:1 **similar** 163:1 177:15 220:25 229:19 237:23 similarity 148:6 similarly 90:14 221:21 **Simmons** 2:12 4:16 **simple** 67:22 68:3,3 205:15 205:19,22 209:20 235:12,25 238:9,21 **simpler** 203:23 **simplest** 195:11 **simplistic** 91:9 213:11 227:25 **simply** 15:5,6 24:2 39:17 114:11 186:12 187:16 **simulation** 178:23 179:5 single 18:11,23 28:19 33:21 39:22 44:8 121:19 185:11 186:11 195:18.24 197:1 198:8 199:24 203:16 205:7 209:16 211:8 234:21 243:7 sink 142:5 185:20,21 sinks 125:23 126:18 185:15 **sir** 5:8 8:9 12:14 16:15 18:15 21:25 25:6 57:2 59:19 63:20 75:3 77:4 80:25 81:3 81:5,7,10 82:2,4,7 85:8 87:7 96:8 97:10 99:19 100:23 102:23 103:13 104:25 112:23 114:15 117:17 118:7 123:10,25 131:5 135:22,25 153:19 158:1 165:3 169:23 170:19 172:24 175:2 191:2 203:7 218:10 site 12:16 29:6 30:5 34:4,8,9 34:16,24 35:3,7 36:3,21 37:6,9,13 38:8,14,18 39:2,9 43:11 46:24 75:6,11 76:9,20 76:22 78:4,15 85:17,20 100:15,18 102:3,9,11,14,18

103:20 110:1,7,8 120:3 123:13 126:7,9,10 127:20 127:25 132:22 136:15,19 137:16,22 146:7,10,13,14 146:25 151:4 162:12,14,22 163:1 181:24,24 184:12 189:8,9 201:7,9 202:8 204:18 216:7 224:3 225:4 227:12 229:4 233:5,15 236:7,23 237:10 247:8 248:1 sites 30:17 32:7 34:17,18,22 35:10,12 39:14 74:8 75:23 78:25 79:23 80:1,5 94:7,8 97:3 103:8 109:5 145:12,14 146:3,5 156:15 162:11,15 162:21,24 163:2,3,6 170:10 170:11 183:23 198:16 219:24 220:2 site-by-site 30:22 170:15 196:4 **site-specific** 34:19 36:5 162:19 166:9 196:4 218:3 **sitting** 241:19 situation 25:15 29:4 40:22 43:24 46:11 52:17,18 64:19 87:21 88:25 109:18 110:16 122:24 125:13 154:9 179:3 220:1 225:1 228:23 230:5 **situations** 16:4 31:19 40:21 46:14 52:3 94:16 108:17 124:18 229:2 241:16 six 17:4 62:23 155:8 175:25 213:23 231:10 size 136:16 233:9 **skip** 107:3 181:11 sleeping 140:6 **slope** 23:19 24:4 128:13 129:1,6,8,10 132:15 222:1 slow 110:25 **slowly** 66:25 110:3 168:4 223:18 small 70:13 74:11 96:25

131:17 135:15 136:18,18

149:25 169:11 178:23

194:14 smaller 15:10 38:7 242:9,16 242:19 **software** 222:8,9 **soil** 5:12 6:11.18 10:16 15:19 16:7 20:17,18,19 23:20 24:4 30:17 31:1,16 37:8 38:5,19 39:19 44:16,18 49:21 53:12 53:19 54:15 63:8 65:10,16 66:8,9,21 67:1,2,5,13,23 68:1,7,16,22 69:1 74:5,6 76:6,8,21 77:17 83:17,19,19 83:20,23,23 84:2 85:16 86:14 87:12 88:1,2,4,5 89:9 89:13,13,16 90:5,24 91:7,16 94:16,25 96:18,22 97:17,23 98:8,15,19,20,20,23 99:20 100:24 101:20 102:25 103:2 103:11,17 105:4,11,14,14 105:19 107:1 108:9,10,23 109:12,16 110:2,10,19,24 111:10,11,12,17,20,22,23 112:5,8,19 113:14,20 114:3 114:8,18,20 115:8 116:18 116:24 117:8 118:2,2,9,11 118:12,17,19,20,23,24 119:1,6,14,17 120:4,7,12 121:5 124:25 125:1,6,14 126:1,1,2,5,9,11,22,23,25 127:17,19,20 128:21,23 129:3,4,6,9,17,20,21,23,24 130:1,8,12,13 132:14,15,18 136:9,9,12 137:11,24 143:7 146:3 155:11,11 160:19,22 160:24 162:12 168:5 171:3 176:15 185:23 195:18,19,25 197:7,8 199:13 201:6 202:3 203:13,17,18 205:4,8,9,14 208:10 209:14 211:20 214:1 214:2 215:14,21 216:13 217:12 219:18 224:10,16,17 224:18 226:5 228:25 237:1 237:4,25 241:10,10 246:9 247:6 **soils** 15:1 16:8,12 20:18 32:9

37:3,7 66:22 85:9,13,15 192:5 35:4 44:5 56:22 65:14 **speaking** 54:14 62:22 64:9 90:10 91:18 93:14,22 94:4 92:11 93:15 94:21 95:9 95:15,20 96:3,20 104:11 214:3 97:13 109:20 111:3 114:24 111:19 113:6 120:13 136:20 specialist 53:13 115:9 145:25 153:8,23 136:21,23 137:1 142:18,22 specialists 7:8 54:16 154:14.16.20.23 155:14.19 144:25 148:8 169:5 202:23 **species** 65:16 113:17 162:16 167:19 168:8,10,24 **specific** 15:1 30:5 34:4,16 185:8 187:11 202:24 solely 142:17 71:25 72:6 73:21 78:4 **statements** 153:2 167:5 solid 118:11 126:24 235:16 107:14,15 120:4,4,4 146:25 states 1:1 29:10 153:15 **solubility** 215:9 221:23 170:8 181:16 203:13 205:4 167:11 191:24 192:1 204:22 **soluble** 65:9 75:7 76:4,7 210:14,15,25 211:19,19,20 220:24 223:6 94:25 114:17 115:7,12 **specifically** 16:11 49:3 65:21 **State's** 193:22 67:6 170:15 187:14 250:11 118:15 127:17,20 128:24 statistical 49:20 104:23 129:7 131:5 176:9 195:19 **specify** 24:19,23 statistically 104:17 speculate 122:23 156:7 218:1 201:8 214:2 215:9 **status** 43:17 solution 127:21 185:11 speculation 156:8 stays 91:3 99:13 102:11 speed 58:11 88:24 186:11 steam 240:13 solutions 181:12 **Spell** 107:20 steep 120:1,2 **Steinmeyer** 1:20 252:5 253:6 **solve** 159:5 **spelled** 48:16 253:24 **somebody** 46:4 47:24 spend 186:23 249:24 **somewhat** 187:12 spent 249:22 **stemmed** 165:24 **sooner** 133:13 **spikes** 76:25 **stenograph** 253:12,12 sophistication 217:10 **split** 197:5 step 25:17 28:8,13 149:3,7,10 **sorption** 111:11,22 112:4,5 **spot** 40:8 130:22 149:11,16,25 150:1,11,16 168:4 197:5 **spread** 241:15 150:21,23 190:17 **sorry** 57:2 82:12 97:4 100:4 spreading 55:11 stepping 72:9 125:10 168:17 170:25 239:4 spreadsheet 80:5 step-by-step 150:9 stickers 13:11 239:10 ss 253:3 sort 9:25 91:16 127:8 129:12 staff 221:12 **stop** 67:15 89:14 90:25 136:7 186:3 191:15 248:1 **stage** 191:13 114:11 128:17 129:13 130:16,21 142:24 175:23 sound 60:22 153:14 180:7 **stand** 152:7 source 43:25 54:20 55:9,16 **standard** 31:15 179:15,16 251:1 64:5 67:24 83:25 95:17 **stopped** 31:20 148:21 174:6 220:22 110:1 113:22,23 123:14,19 **started** 91:4 173:17 206:19 175:25 176:11 134:2,21 144:15,18,19 208:22,22 stops 77:19,23 145:8 156:3 157:7 185:20 starting 93:20 208:20 **storm** 137:17 230:23 231:25 185:24 219:12,13,17,22,25 starts 74:5 85:9 115:3 148:2 232:3,4,6,21 233:2,12 storms 139:1 232:23,24 221:22 231:19 236:7 239:16 state 1:5,8,19,22 4:7,9,11 5:5 11:13 26:18 29:9 50:8 **STP** 30:19 31:4,10,23 32:2 239:17 242:7 245:25 246:4 sources 32:19 51:1 82:10 52:19,21 53:1,5 86:12 88:20 34:13,14,24,25 35:12,13 183:11 185:15 246:8 143:3 156:9 161:10,15 36:1,10 37:3,8 38:20 39:6,6 193:21 237:18 239:10 253:3 39:25 40:4,15 61:17,20,23 south 2:16 17:3 **space** 202:2,4,6 253:8 62:5 76:10 79:1 80:2 87:18 spatially 157:7 stated 90:2 214:4 87:23 88:1 89:16 90:5,5,15 speak 16:10 124:6 182:24 statement 14:21 24:6 34:6 104:1 106:5,10 108:25

109:3 116:13 118:5 119:5,9 128:7 162:2 164:10,18 176:12,17 201:6 206:16 207:9 210:22 211:5 214:1 215:1.5 217:2 221:4 237:6 **STPs** 30:6,10 32:6 36:23 38:4 38:12 75:17 76:4 79:23 101:8 102:18 121:12 159:20 213:14 160:6,14 162:21 **straight** 37:11 67:25 117:16 strategic 191:17 **strategies** 193:5,13 **strategy** 26:22 27:8 stratification 111:25 stream 125:24 127:24 130:17 136:11 137:21,23,24 138:5 138:6,7,11,12,15,16,18,21 139:5 140:17 141:6,9,18,18 141:22,24 142:2 148:7,8,9 148:12,15,23 150:18 159:16 201:5 231:20 232:10,22 233:6,10,16 234:8 245:9 streams 77:21 **Street** 2:4,6,10,13 strike 74:21 148:25 stringent 184:1 **strongly** 243:22 structure 223:9 structured 222:6 148:8 **student** 11:16 **studied** 16:12 67:6,7 136:1,4 studies 12:6 32:1 90:3 91:17 145:12 91:25 92:1,3,4,7,14,18 114:16 116:24 132:24 156:15 163:9 178:23,24 179:6,7 study 6:7 91:20 101:24 102:2 104:13 105:3 115:6 135:14 136:8,19 140:15 141:5 142:7 143:4 163:16,18,18 171:21 203:21 **studying** 249:22 stuff 167:24 styled 1:17 252:6 subfield 219:16

**subject** 69:2,11,25 70:4 83:21 91:21 99:14 242:2 submitted 13:4 subparagraph 16:17,18 22:21 54:18 56:9 57:1 63:12 68:25 69:5 117:18 120:20 123:9 133:15 211:3 SUBSCRIBED 252:17 subsequent 77:18 **subsidize** 51:2 52:25 193:23 subsidized 29:8 subsidizes 29:10 50:18 **subsidy** 52:24 substances 57:8 **substantial** 66:22 123:14 159:19 169:6 220:12 substantially 109:17 substitute 208:9 substituting 113:7 subsurface 168:12 172:8 173:10 176:21 subwatershed 27:23.24 successful 97:6 suck 140:11 sufficient 16:4 sufficiently 142:22 **suggest** 52:4 114:19 116:17 **suggested** 50:6 52:3 **suggesting** 21:23,25 144:16 suggests 143:10 144:4 **Suite** 2:10,17 sum 246:22 summaries 201:13 summary 91:24 92:1 93:7 97:13 180:3 185:2 198:10 **summation** 245:24,25 summer 178:17,18 212:22 supervision 253:14 supplement 64:5 **supplied** 241:13 **supply** 20:14 21:15 33:6 43:7 43:10,15 96:6 118:19,21

180:14,14 supplying 21:17 65:2 150:14 **support** 137:16 228:10 supported 121:9 **supports** 139:19 221:14,16 **suppose** 42:18 165:1 sure 10:19 14:6,8 18:3 25:1,4 53:14,21 104:18 115:1 124:21 133:21 135:18 143:5 152:19 159:23 189:19 202:12 206:7 209:12 **surface** 65:10 66:4,6,8 69:2 69:13,25 77:16 80:14 93:13 98:20 111:12,17,20,22 112:1,8,19,21 123:20 124:13,22 125:14 132:15 134:1 136:10 137:24 138:25 141:22,24 142:4 149:3 155:18 166:3 168:11 172:8 173:10 174:24 175:1,4,6 176:7,15 227:16 240:20,22 241:10,15,22,25 surface-saturated 137:18 surplus 153:12 161:12 surpluses 153:19 surprise 77:5 **surprised** 153:18 223:15 **surrounding** 6:22 7:1 188:21 **suspect** 94:7 128:22 156:12 162:24 204:7 sustainability 188:1,10,12,14 188:18,19 189:3 192:12,20 193:2 sustainable 180:6 188:15,16 188:24 **switch** 238:3 sworn 4:23,25 252:17 253:9 synonymous 19:12 **system** 90:25 98:11 100:9,9 101:17,20 103:10,21,23 104:11 105:17,20 110:21 135:10 185:23 249:10,11 systems 9:16 31:14 65:8,12 95:12 96:3 103:5 104:3 105:5,10 135:6 155:5

291

 $\mathbf{T}$ **T** 3:3 253:1,1 table 99:18,22 100:2,12 141:23 142:3 171:18,23 223:1,3 246:25 tabulation 236:24 **tailors** 140:16 take 44:20 49:2 51:12 54:4 67:17,25 68:1 78:13 86:9 98:14 102:3 104:10 105:24 106:8,9 115:20,21 116:6,7 120:12 121:1 122:1,3,6 123:1 139:21 149:3,9,11,17 152:8 164:14 190:17 195:9 199:6 210:2 215:11 taken 1:17 66:1 68:21 83:21 102:9 105:16 174:12 185:22 185:22 211:17 232:11 253:18 takes 95:25 96:22 106:4,5 169:10 talk 8:21 17:6,11 20:4 23:1 23:25 49:24 57:3 65:18 69:16 73:15 78:8 93:11 109:10,24 111:8 113:3 131:14 132:4,15 133:7,24 165:15 173:1 178:7,16 180:5 183:4 188:7,9 209:19 212:17 talked 12:21 47:20 48:10,11 48:19,23,25 49:3,10 60:1 63:3 67:9 75:21 86:11 94:9 111:3 113:11 120:2 128:10 131:4 141:8 155:23 179:6 180:19 182:7 188:8 189:7 191:11 201:16 205:18 206:3 231:18 236:17 talking 17:5,11 24:11,14 29:9 33:16 34:9 47:24 56:16 57:1 67:3 103:13 106:25 117:6 122:3 132:11 158:11 163:16 165:7,18,19 179:21 180:24 183:3 191:21 196:20 198:3 200:13 206:2,10,23

209:6,8 210:10 211:14 229:21 231:9 talks 112:25 114:15 145:7 172:2 199:25 207:6 216:14 tape 45:4 123:2 187:8,18 233:21 tapes 44:21 84:19 targeted 191:25 tasked 175:17 taught 11:15 taxpavers 50:23 51:6 teach 5:10 11:2,4 81:25 82:3 teaching 5:13 249:24 team 26:23 teams 26:23 **technical** 170:2,3 technique 84:4 techniques 39:21 **telephone** 48:12,13 tell 8:19 36:20 54:18 56:9 67:4 73:10 82:12 83:25 84:6 87:25 89:10 91:13 108:4,20 123:16 178:19 183:20 186:1 212:20 213:16 219:11 238:18 248:7 249:3 telling 22:17 28:20 36:7 40:2 45:5 78:19 81:15 203:22 206:18 tells 209:10 temperatures 235:23 ten 84:6 90:6 109:13 119:18 140:3 231:3,8,13,24 234:7 234:24 tend 98:13 tens 160:23 tenth 82:19 231:3 ten-year 230:17 231:7,10,16 231:24 232:3,24 term 91:10 188:22 219:13 **terminology** 12:17 42:4 terms 19:14,17 23:19 39:8 70:18,21 106:8 108:16,20 137:20 155:13 172:2,22 195:11 245:7 test 20:17,18,18 31:1 38:19

39:19 63:8 76:6,21 86:14,21 88:1,2 89:9,13 90:24 91:7 105:19 108:10,10 110:10 113:6 114:8,20 115:8 116:18,24 117:8 118:23 119:14,17 121:6 146:3 160:19,22,25 163:17,22 195:18,25 199:13 203:1 208:10 209:14 211:20 215:14,21 216:13 217:12 237:2,4,25 246:9,13 247:6 **testified** 5:1,19 testify 4:25 10:20 13:2 14:1 47:14,19,21,22,24 48:5,7 49:7 59:13 85:3 86:11 130:6 178:1,2 250:23 253:9 **testimony** 5:23 6:1 12:25 14:8 18:6 59:16,20,24 72:10 84:15 211:23 tests 179:5 200:6 202:23 text 169:20 212:1,2,3 **textural** 132:15 **Thank** 4:22 13:14 theory 192:3 250:11 **Theresa** 2:9 4:17 thing 12:18 13:21 27:19,21 69:21 87:13,20 105:21 121:20 127:8 141:20 176:20 185:12 229:3 236:8 240:10 245:9 247:17 249:7 things 8:23 16:19,22 24:6 34:14,21 49:5 53:20 72:23 89:22 131:4 137:9 151:6,23 152:2 155:13 170:1,4 178:14 197:23 201:18 222:2 235:21 236:9 243:17 247:24 think 7:8 8:18 9:1 16:10 22:20 30:4 31:6 32:9 34:6 35:3,4 37:11 40:8,21,25 41:1,9 45:11 51:1,2 53:19 53:22 54:17,23 59:14 71:22 72:15 80:21 83:14 87:19,20 90:12 91:9 97:13 101:2 106:24 107:4,13,25 108:9 109:1 110:13,23 119:18,19

120:9 121:17 131:3 134:16	113:3 115:20,21 118:5	174:20 229:22
137:6 143:20 148:24 151:21	119:10 120:9 121:1 123:4,8	totally 39:18 50:12
151:25 154:25 157:8 158:11	127:20 152:10,14 168:12,19	touched 54:17
158:21 160:23 161:1 165:19	168:20 171:24 177:22	track 187:17
166:11 169:24 170:4,12,19	186:22 195:1,5 230:20	trade 11:24
179:2 181:22,23 183:16	231:4 233:24 234:3,6	trade-offs 187:1
186:16,16 189:16 191:21	241:19 249:22,24 251:3	train 190:13
192:15 194:18 196:15	253:18	trained 12:23
197:14 198:12 201:11,25,25	timeout 62:8	training 11:15 12:22
202:1 203:23 204:3,10	times 12:1 22:13 27:20 40:4	transaction 183:17
206:10,14 208:6 213:4	40:19 62:23 101:6 175:9,12	transcribed 253:13
217:4,10,11 223:12 226:21	175:13,19 176:4 199:9,10	transcript 14:8 140:10 252:5
227:1 228:15,24 232:11,25	199:12,13,18,19,20 200:15	253:17
233:11,12 234:20 236:16,25	201:22 207:8,15,24 209:16	transfer 41:12,20
237:7 239:3 242:21 243:21	209:20 210:8,21 212:2	transformations 118:18
244:16 246:4 249:12,14,14	216:23 223:14 228:23 239:7	transition 71:22
249:19 250:11,25	245:19,20,23 247:12,18	translate 139:11
thinking 51:11	tips 66:2	translating 248:14
thinks 213:6	tissue 98:17 105:12	transport 29:8,10 32:22
third 29:11 63:14 64:19 74:2	tissues 65:11	41:23 42:19 50:16,19 52:22
105:1 127:22	title 171:22 172:4	55:23 81:12 82:5 83:7
third-party 183:13,20	titled 248:25	99:14,15,15 112:9 131:11
thought 45:13 49:22 133:13	today 4:4 5:24 14:1 24:11	138:24 155:18 157:7 162:22
154:19 170:20 182:20,24	58:7 154:24 155:15,19	184:5 191:15 192:7,8
196:8 201:10 213:9	189:15 235:15	219:18,20 221:25 224:4
thoughts 54:10,12	TOLBERT 1:6	transportation 69:13
thousand 79:7 209:7 225:25	told 10:10 30:13 91:23	transported 42:14 46:15
thousands 80:7 160:23	118:25 148:1 211:24	81:15 87:5 123:15 146:14
<b>three</b> 64:14 73:14 104:7,14	ton 19:22 225:23,24	166:3,10 183:24 185:16
105:3 173:19 175:3 223:14	tongue 154:25	transporting 192:16
224:8 240:20,21,22 241:18	tons 75:1,1,1 209:7 225:9,10	transports 76:25
241:23,25 242:3 246:8	225:13,20 244:22	trap 129:3
three-year 103:16	tool 35:22 36:16,17,20 43:12	treat 235:22
<b>thumb</b> 101:4 141:11 240:9	104:23 162:25 163:1 218:21	treated 120:5
tied 118:12 155:1 157:15	220:21 228:4 243:21	treatment 91:6 101:21
234:7	tools 78:23 84:1 157:19	103:18
<b>tight</b> 184:7	220:19	treatments 103:4
tighter 184:5	<b>top</b> 14:14,20 17:2 63:12 69:9	<b>Trevor</b> 2:5 4:9
tilling 111:17	87:22 93:7 99:18 100:12	trial 13:2 56:6 59:16
<b>Tim</b> 9:8,10	117:18,21 128:1 132:10	tributaries 80:12
<b>time</b> 4:5 8:22 10:13,23 25:7	171:18 187:6 223:21 230:15	<b>tributary</b> 26:22,23 27:8
40:20 45:3 74:3 82:19	236:9 237:16 244:5	<b>tried</b> 216:11
83:10,11 84:21 85:1 95:25	topography 130:20	trouble 116:4
96:23 104:9 106:4,5,8,19,23	total 51:5 63:17 80:8,10	troublesome 187:18
107:9,14 108:7,25 109:3	100:17 155:16 172:8 173:7	<b>true</b> 16:1,8 19:15 29:25 40:9
	I	I

40:11,12,14 60:24 87:8,11 87:15 89:19,21 93:14 94:4 94:14,21 95:4,10,20 109:19 111:2 114:23 115:9 147:7,9 153:8 154:4.16 155:14.19 156:24 186:14,15 187:11 214:11,14 252:5,7 253:17 **truly** 147:8 truncate 199:7 229:6 truncates 211:14 TRUSTEE 1:7 **truth** 4:25 5:1,1 171:6 253:10 253:10.10 **try** 6:21 13:15 28:11 121:25 164:18 186:4 189:8,9 198:15 215:11 238:4 trying 9:1,21 10:15,22 19:18 20:19 23:24 40:7 41:9 51:25 58:10 61:11 79:19 87:19,20 97:17 110:15,17 113:13 115:17 117:16 129:18 148:25 154:21 159:4 161:22,24 166:4,13 169:25 186:17,18 197:24 217:5 232:3 233:15 **Tucker** 2:19 4:14,14 **Tulsa** 1:18,19 2:4,11,17 253:4,7 tune 245:10 **Turkey** 4:18 turkeys 84:12 turn 14:13 16:16 99:17 111:6 137:8 142:14 155:21 165:21 171:17 180:2 183:12 187:6 222:24 **Turner** 203:22 **Turning** 56:8 turns 118:13 235:16,18 twelve 119:18 120:8 121:7,10 122:5,17 twice 146:1 223:14 **two** 9:8 33:18 34:23 35:12 36:22 38:1,10 39:4,14 40:2 40:16 66:12,16,19 73:13 100:22 101:6 103:4 105:23

109:13 114:6 117:6 155:8 157:21 166:17 168:16 173:1 173:8 181:11 185:10 186:14 189:2,4 190:1 199:9,10,12 199:13.18.19.20 200:10.15 201:22 206:24 207:8,15,24 208:17 209:16,17,20,20 210:21 212:2 213:3 224:7 232:20 233:11 236:12 239:7 239:10,12,13,16 247:10 two-tenths 174:21 **Tylenol** 230:13 **type** 11:5 67:2 128:23 129:4 129:21 163:1 188:22 201:3 230:23 **types** 71:25 203:13 205:4 typewritten 253:14 typical 31:6 167:10 223:3 **typically** 31:3 49:16 57:9 62:12,15,18,19 64:12,14 70:14,17 71:4 76:6 94:11 95:1 121:24 154:10 155:1 157:15 167:14 183:12 215:24 216:4

#### U

**Tyson** 1:11 9:11

ubiquitously 178:6 **Uh-huh** 14:17 29:16 35:9 36:12 37:25 38:9,11 41:21 42:23 46:3 51:10 54:2 60:3 63:19 76:2 83:5 90:8 94:3 98:6 100:13 103:24 106:3 109:8,15 113:2 114:10 118:1,6 119:8 121:3 128:15 132:13,17,23 133:9 139:3 144:6 167:18 168:23 172:6 172:18 173:11 174:5,19 175:21 182:18 188:6 195:8 196:24 197:3,10 199:2 202:17 203:20 206:5 208:25 218:5 222:25 223:24 224:23 227:19 232:5 234:13 235:17 235:20 236:2,13 239:15,19 240:23 242:23 244:1,4,9,23

247:25 **UK** 153:17 **ultimate** 157:23 158:7,10 unchanged 110:4 undergraduate 11:5 **underlie** 237:14 238:2 underlies 236:4 underline 210:22 underlined 210:21 **underneath** 231:16 236:15 236:22 **understand** 10:15,25 16:13 17:18 21:2 25:1 34:11 37:15,18,19 51:7 73:15,16 76:20 81:13 99:22 121:25 137:9 141:4 147:21 152:2 157:8 159:23 178:10 198:5 200:12 206:7,21 210:4,6 211:11,23 212:15 232:13 233:19 242:21 244:2,25 245:11 understanding 12:8 22:17 23:13 24:1 50:19 52:25 70:13,17 71:21,24 87:15 88:13 99:8,13,16 116:9 119:14 126:15,16 135:4 180:10 184:18 191:21 193:9 223:16 233:1 245:13 uneven 157:15 158:12 unfortunately 95:11 **uniform** 17:2 138:19 166:1,5 166:11 223:10 uniformly 16:25 138:2 139:11 170:14 178:6 uninformed 171:2 uninterrupted 128:1,13 130:23 **unique** 139:10 unit 100:21 101:4 199:16 229:13,13,19 230:1 240:5 **United** 1:1 153:15 167:11 191:23 192:1 units 100:16 199:13 230:1,6 230:8 242:9,17,19 universally 151:21

universities 156:13 **university** 5:9,10 6:4 11:2,8,9 48:21 58:25 59:11 107:17 143:3 156:9 163:9 237:18 unknowingly 170:7 unknown 119:7,13 unlettered 120:21 unmet 61:7,17 **unopened** 215:3 216:9 unreliable 179:11 unusual 87:21 108:14,19 **updated** 151:24 **updates** 151:16 **uphill** 130:25 **upper** 109:9 111:7 153:3 221:1 **uptake** 69:12 90:4 113:9 118:20 155:9 168:1 172:7 173:5 174:11 **urea** 55:21 **USA** 153:5 157:13 **USDA** 59:9 use 12:20,23 18:11 19:3,5,6 19:11 22:5 23:11,16,22 24:3 25:11,25 27:14 28:6,19,22 28:24 29:18 32:12,25 33:10 35:8 36:19,24 41:3,24 42:1 42:21 43:9,14,24 44:8,12,15 52:1,2 54:6 70:25 91:14 93:25 96:9 104:22 116:10 116:21 121:25 122:22 136:8 140:20 145:11 160:2 167:16 182:5,8,11,13,15,25 189:8 189:16 192:18 195:24 198:15 202:7 206:15 211:20 211:24 212:2 217:7 230:23 236:24 239:6 245:6 250:2 **useful** 117:1 uses 39:10 181:13,19,25 182:2 188:2 189:6 usually 63:2 66:1 91:15 122:1 123:19 227:23 **utilization** 18:9 21:13 28:17 29:3,6 42:12 44:6 utilize 18:17,24,25 23:6,8

25:14 29:2,12 55:20,21 145:10 183:11,12 192:10 **utilized** 163:19 167:15 183:24 199:4 204:4 213:24 245:14 utilizing 23:4 109:25 147:10 186:19 241:20 utmost 186:20

 $\mathbf{V}$ Vadas 195:15,15,22 196:10 196:13,19,23 197:12 198:5 198:21 201:20 203:21 204:21 207:7 209:15 212:18 212:21 213:1,12,16,24,24 214:4,19 217:4,22 **validated** 121:21 122:12 **valuable** 19:4 192:10 **value** 103:21,22 116:18 166:6 167:2 203:16 205:7 206:16 223:23 236:23 238:6,19 values 160:22,25 237:14 variability 95:23 variable 20:1 91:1,24 144:15 144:18,19 145:8 157:7 230:3,4,5 231:19 variances 103:13 variation 104:7 179:18 196:4 varied 67:1 variety 69:2,11 137:2 187:7 200:9 various 12:2 16:19.22 56:16 90:23 186:5 201:17 228:2 vary 26:18 varying 132:2 **vegetation** 131:9,22 vehicles 166:4 **venture** 217:3 version 151:14,15 152:1,1,1,2 212:11 233:19 versus 67:12 109:13 210:14 vertical 83:23 vertically 172:11 VIDEOGRAPHER 4:3,19

4:22 44:22 45:2 84:20,25

106:18,22 123:3,7 152:9,13 194:25 195:4 233:23 234:2 251:2 VIDEOTAPED 1:14 view 24:8 29:13 161:23 186:20 194:3 199:6 233:20 virtue 1:21 24:3 **vision** 53:14 **Volume** 1:14 254:2 **volumes** 137:15 voluntary 185:4 **vouch** 74:25 **vs** 1:10 **VSA** 148:4 vulnerability 248:1

W **W** 1:4 3:3 wait 41:15 200:24 224:14 waiting 100:3 244:13 wake 140:8 walk 167:4 223:18 239:20 walked 14:4,5,7 **wallets** 186:23 want 12:23 19:4,6 23:10 24:8 24:20 25:1 35:8 36:18,18,24 40:11 61:4,20 64:4 110:20 114:4 116:2.6 117:15 133:17 134:11 145:9,11 150:4 165:14,15,22 187:15 194:20 204:16 206:7,8 209:12 245:7.10 wanted 149:12 wants 45:19 193:13 **warning** 44:20 washes 131:19 **Washington** 8:15 161:11 wasn't 7:21 44:2 54:10 58:4 79:18 121:1 169:17 175:9 waste 54:5 59:18,18 72:12,19 74:14,15,22 76:10,15 79:2 83:4 85:4 87:9,17 89:20 94:5 98:7 water 6:13,15,22,23 7:1,8,15 9:18,20 27:2,24 28:2 72:13

72:20,25 73:13,19,25 74:4,4 158:4,6,6,8,15,16,17,18,19 200:12 206:22 207:13,18 74:6,9,10,13 78:6,6,11,16 159:7,10,15,19 160:6,8 208:17,20 217:12 229:6 161:16 162:3,9,9,17,20 230:13 233:23 240:24 80:11 81:1,6,17,22 82:17 83:8,23 84:8,13 85:5,18,23 163:7,11,11 164:1,11 178:7 we've 11:14 12:1 44:19 49:3 85:25 86:5 87:5 88:17,20 180:25 181:21,23,24 184:15 94:9 109:19 110:23 111:3 93:12 95:1 112:13,14 185:16 188:5 191:10 193:4 113:11 129:15 131:4 151:18 155:15 172:11 179:21 188:8 116:25 118:17 123:16,19,20 193:6 204:12,14 211:20 123:23,24 124:2,12,21 219:8 221:3 250:3,10,13,19 198:3 201:16 217:15 222:16 125:16,18,19,23,25 126:1,2 watersheds 26:15 191:14 249:10,22 126:3,5,22 127:14,15,17,18 192:9,22 **WE-38** 137:4 127:19 128:2,14,18 129:11 waterways 135:2,5 whatsoever 86:22 129:25 131:20,21,23 132:1 way 18:1 27:13 45:16 52:24 wide 137:2 170:8 200:9 66:2,9 81:21 105:21 119:1 133:2 134:1,5,22 135:6 203:18 205:9 136:10,12 137:21,25 138:4 126:8 128:7 129:1,7 141:18 widely 110:24 138:7,17,21 141:3,22,23 149:3 151:16,17 158:14 widespread 187:10 willing 34:21 44:4 182:2 185:22,25 190:13 142:3,4,9 149:8 150:19 wish 37:21 159:15,16 166:3 171:3 201:22 208:17 228:1 232:1 235:4,5,9 240:14 243:4,18 193:14 196:5,6,8 197:4,6,15 witness 1:16 4:22 48:10 54:8 200:19 203:1 227:11,16 244:25 245:11 246:24 250:7 82:19 252:8 253:9,22 229:24,25 232:1,1 235:15 ways 30:19 88:7 129:18 wondering 230:7 235:22 240:13 241:11 190:1 208:17 wood 125:4,7 waters 7:6 69:14 88:9 134:1 weather 235:14 **wooded** 125:8,10,13 135:2 155:18 weathering 16:7 word 60:14 97:16 110:12,14 watershed 16:9,12,14 21:24 weathermen 231:9 170:17 188:12,21 22:3 23:9 26:19,20 27:1,3 Webster 8:11,12 9:4 10:9 words 16:21 122:22 129:3 27:12,13,16 28:1,2 30:1,7 wedded 26:9 228:11 146:18 179:18 work 6:10 8:12 10:24 14:4 30:20 32:13,20,22,23,24 weigh 243:17 weight 224:19,22 242:22 33:2,4 47:11,15 48:11,23 22:8,10 26:9 27:1,15 32:6 49:1,16 55:24 56:2 60:2,6 243:10,14 247:19 42:16 59:10 73:16 115:2 60:13 61:2,15 62:19 67:5,11 weighted 243:16 117:4 134:11 152:2 186:4 191:6 195:14,15 198:6,21 70:10,10,19,22,25,25 72:7 weighting 247:12 weights 226:6 243:3,13 72:12,13,20 73:1,6,8 74:1,4 204:23,24 213:1 221:20 wells 136:9 74:23 75:18 77:2,10,22,25 232:14 237:21 246:24 247:3 79:1,10,14,24 80:2,18,22,24 went 45:8 89:15 91:8 92:13 **worked** 27:10 working 9:3 53:25 59:3 96:12 81:2,9,18 82:11,23 84:11 174:3 85:5 88:9,21 89:1 90:11 west 2:4,10 17:3 151:14 157:21 245:12 92:5 94:5 99:4,10 102:7,17 we'll 17:6 41:23 42:17 83:16 works 9:11 66:9 119:1 151:16 95:8 113:3 157:13 167:3 **world** 29:15 37:24 40:6 77:13 120:13 121:13 124:1,19 93:22 122:9 139:12 148:3 126:14 130:2 134:20 135:15 209:19 236:25 238:4 we're 20:5,21 21:6 24:14 182:19 183:7 190:6,16 135:19,23,24 136:2,4,13,17 136:21,24 137:4,5 138:2 37:14,15 44:22 52:22 67:3 191:6 204:8 216:12 226:16 139:10,12 140:16,18,22 68:7,9,14 71:22 84:20 235:22 142:8,18 143:2,7,13 144:8 106:18 117:6 122:2 123:3 worldwide 191:24 192:1 144:18 147:4 148:10 149:14 139:21 151:14 152:9 155:12 worms 215:2,3 216:8 154:2 155:23 157:8,20,23 157:19 175:16 177:22 worry 53:15

worst 178:13 179:3 worth 29:11,13 wouldn't 24:8 30:4 33:8 34:17 40:21 65:2 84:16 96:15 104:18,19 124:15 141:19 160:2 162:15 190:23 197:13 223:12 225:11 227:13 write 57:24 94:2

write 57:24 94:2 writing 12:19 171:1 228:7 written 171:8 181:2 222:7,9 222:10

wrong 145:3 146:22 147:1 160:21 161:1 178:3,20 179:4 205:10 248:8 wrote 94:18,19 146:21 196:19

### X

**X** 3:1 202:7 208:10

## $\mathbf{Y}$

Y 208:9 210:2 yeah 16:23 24:8 25:9 45:24 69:6 78:20 80:20 95:10 125:8 138:9 168:18,25 196:15 202:13 206:13 223:17 224:5 240:11 year 10:3,6 119:19 154:18 172:22 173:21 174:16,22 176:2 231:3 232:17,23 233:3,5,8 234:6,23 vears 6:5 21:14 31:17 56:16 57:3 59:5 91:4 95:14 100:16,17,19 104:7,14 105:3,24 108:11 109:3 151:18,25,25 154:21,22 155:3,5 156:15 172:12 173:15,19 175:3,5,23,25 176:18 231:3,8,13,24 234:7 234:24

year-to-year 103:13 104:7 Yesterday 14:2 yield 109:18 173:4 174:3 Yikes 218:9

### ${\bf Z}$

zero 84:7 87:13 100:18 103:18 114:18 119:24 229:3 229:4 236:11 238:5,7,12 241:6 zinc 15:14,18,20,25 zone 98:15

**zone** 98:15 0 **01:07PM** 106:25 107:5,10 **01:08PM** 107:15,20,25 108:5 **01:09PM** 108:10,15,20 **01:10PM** 108:25 109:5,10 **01:11PM** 109:20,25 110:5 **01:12PM** 110:10.15.20 **01:13PM** 110:25 111:5,10 **01:14PM** 111:15,20,25 **01:15PM** 112:5,10,15,20 **01:16PM** 112:25 113:10,15 **01:17PM** 113:20,25 114:5,10 **01:18PM** 114:15,20,25 **01:19PM** 115:5,10,15,20,25 **01:20PM** 116:5,10 **01:21PM** 116:15,20,25 **01:22PM** 117:5,10,15 **01:23PM** 117:20,25 118:5,10 **01:24PM** 118:15,20,25 119:5 **01:25PM** 119:10,15,20,25 **01:26PM** 120:5,10,15,20 **01:27PM** 120:25 121:5,10 **01:28PM** 121:15,20,25 122:5 **01:29PM** 122:10,15,20,25 **01:30PM** 123:5.10 **01:31PM** 123:15,20,25 **01:32PM** 124:5,10,15 **01:33PM** 124:20,25 125:5,10 125:15 **01:34PM** 125:20,25 126:5 **01:35PM** 126:10,15,20,25 **01:36PM** 127:5,10,15,20,25 **01:37PM** 128:5,10 **01:38PM** 128:15,20,25 129:5 129:10 **01:39PM** 129:15,20,25 130:5 **01:40PM** 130:10,15,20,25

**01:41PM** 131:5,10,15,20,25 **01:43PM** 132:5,10,15 **01:44PM** 132:20,25 133:5 **01:46PM** 133:10,15,20 **01:47PM** 133:25 134:5.10 **01:48PM** 134:15,20,25 **01:49PM** 135:5,10,15 **01:50PM** 135:20,25 136:5,10 **01:51PM** 136:15,20,25 **01:52PM** 137:5,10,15 **01:53PM** 137:20,25 138:5,10 **01:54PM** 138:15,20 **01:55PM** 138:25 139:5,10 **01:56PM** 139:15,20,25 140:5 **01:57PM** 140:15,20,25 141:5 **01:58PM** 141:10,15,20 142:5 **01:59PM** 142:10,15 **02:00PM** 142:20,25 143:5 **02:01PM** 143:10,15,20 **02:02PM** 143:25 144:5,10,15 **02:03PM** 144:20,25 145:5 **02:04PM** 145:10,15,20,25 **02:05PM** 146:5,10,15 **02:06PM** 146:20,25 147:5,10 **02:07PM** 147:15,20,25 148:5 **02:08PM** 148:10,15,20 **02:09PM** 148:25 149:5,10,15 **02:10PM** 149:20,25 150:5 **02:11PM** 150:10,15,20 **02:12PM** 150:25 151:5,10 **02:13PM** 151:15,20,25 152:5 152:10 **02:21PM** 152:15,20 **02:22PM** 152:25 153:5,10,15 **02:23PM** 153:20,25 154:5,10 154:15 **02:24PM** 154:20,25 155:5,10 **02:25PM** 155:15,20,25 **02:26PM** 156:5,10,15 **02:27PM** 156:20,25 157:5,10 **02:28PM** 157:15,20,25 158:5 **02:29PM** 158:10,15 **02:30PM** 158:25 159:5,10,15 **02:31PM** 159:20,25 160:5 **02:32PM** 160:10,15,20,25

02.22DM 161.5 10.15	02.14DM 190.5 10 15 20	04-00DM 216-5-10-15-20-25
<b>02:33PM</b> 161:5,10,15	<b>03:14PM</b> 189:5,10,15,20	<b>04:09PM</b> 216:5,10,15,20,25
<b>02:34PM</b> 161:20,25 162:5,10	<b>03:15PM</b> 190:5,10,15,20	<b>04:10PM</b> 217:5,15
<b>02:35PM</b> 162:15,20,25 163:5	<b>03:16PM</b> 190:25 191:5,10,15	<b>04:11PM</b> 217:20,25 218:5
<b>02:36PM</b> 163:10,15,20	<b>03:17PM</b> 191:20,25 192:5,10	<b>04:12PM</b> 218:10,15,20,25
<b>02:37PM</b> 163:25 164:5,10	<b>03:18PM</b> 192:15,20,25	<b>04:13PM</b> 219:5,10,15
<b>02:38PM</b> 164:15,20	<b>03:19PM</b> 193:5,10,15,20	<b>04:14PM</b> 219:20,25 220:5,10
<b>02:39PM</b> 164:25 165:5	<b>03:20PM</b> 193:25 194:5,10,15	<b>04:15PM</b> 220:15,20,25
<b>02:40PM</b> 165:10,15	<b>03:21PM</b> 194:20,25	<b>04:16PM</b> 221:5,10,15
<b>02:41PM</b> 165:20,25	<b>03:35PM</b> 195:5,10	<b>04:17PM</b> 221:20,25 222:5,10
<b>02:42PM</b> 166:5,10	<b>03:36PM</b> 195:15,20	222:15
<b>02:43PM</b> 166:15,20,25	<b>03:37PM</b> 195:25 196:5,10	<b>04:18PM</b> 222:20,25
<b>02:44PM</b> 167:5,10,15,20	<b>03:38PM</b> 196:15,20	<b>04:19PM</b> 223:5,10,15
<b>02:45PM</b> 167:25 168:5,10,15	<b>03:39PM</b> 196:25 197:5,10	<b>04:20PM</b> 223:25 224:5,10,15
<b>02:46PM</b> 168:20,25 169:5,10	<b>03:40PM</b> 197:15,20,25	<b>04:21PM</b> 224:20,25 225:5,10
<b>02:47PM</b> 169:15,20,25 170:5	<b>03:41PM</b> 198:5,10,15,20	<b>04:22PM</b> 225:15,20,25 226:5
<b>02:48PM</b> 170:10,15,20,25	<b>03:42PM</b> 198:25 199:5,10	<b>04:23PM</b> 226:15,20,25
<b>02:49PM</b> 171:5,10,15,20	<b>03:43PM</b> 199:15,20,25 200:5	<b>04:24PM</b> 227:5,10,15
<b>02:50PM</b> 171:25 172:5,10,15	<b>03:44PM</b> 200:10,15,20,25	<b>04:25PM</b> 227:20,25 228:5
<b>02:51PM</b> 172:20 173:5,10,15	<b>03:45PM</b> 201:5,10,15,20	<b>04:26PM</b> 228:10,15,20,25
173:20	<b>03:46PM</b> 201:25 202:5,10	229:5
<b>02:52PM</b> 173:25 174:5,10,15	<b>03:47PM</b> 202:15,20	<b>04:27PM</b> 229:10,15,20,25
<b>02:53PM</b> 174:20,25 175:5,10	<b>03:48PM</b> 202:25 203:5,10,15	<b>04:28PM</b> 230:5,10,15,20
<b>02:54PM</b> 175:15,20,25 176:5	<b>03:49PM</b> 203:20,25 204:5	<b>04:29PM</b> 230:25 231:5,10
176:10	<b>03:50PM</b> 204:10,15,20,25	<b>04:30PM</b> 231:20,25 232:5,10
<b>02:55PM</b> 176:15,20	<b>03:51PM</b> 205:5,10,15,20	232:15
<b>02:56PM</b> 176:25 177:5,10	<b>03:52PM</b> 205:25 206:5	<b>04:31PM</b> 232:20,25 233:5,10
<b>02:57PM</b> 177:15,20	<b>03:53PM</b> 206:10,15	<b>04:32PM</b> 233:15,20,25
<b>02:58PM</b> 177:25 178:5,10,15	<b>03:54PM</b> 206:20,25 207:5,10	<b>04:39PM</b> 234:5,10
<b>02:59PM</b> 178:20,25 179:5	207:15	<b>04:40PM</b> 234:15,20,25
<b>03:00PM</b> 179:10,15,20	<b>03:55PM</b> 207:20,25	<b>04:41PM</b> 235:5,10
<b>03:01PM</b> 179:25 180:5,10	<b>03:56PM</b> 208:5	<b>04:42PM</b> 235:15,20,25 236:5
<b>03:02PM</b> 180:15,20,25 181:5	<b>03:57PM</b> 208:10	236:10
<b>03:03PM</b> 181:10,15,20	<b>03:58PM</b> 208:15,20,25 209:5	<b>04:43PM</b> 236:15,20,25
<b>03:04PM</b> 181:25 182:5,10	<b>03:59PM</b> 209:10,15,20,25	<b>04:44PM</b> 237:5,10,15,20,25
<b>03:05PM</b> 182:15,20,25 183:5	<b>038</b> 208:8,12 209:23	<b>04:45PM</b> 238:5,10,15,20
183:10	<b>04</b> 103:17	<b>04:46PM</b> 238:25 239:5,10
<b>03:06PM</b> 183:15,20,25	<b>04:00PM</b> 210:5,10,15,20,25	<b>04:47PM</b> 239:15,20,25 240:5
<b>03:07PM</b> 184:5,10,15	<b>04:01PM</b> 211:5,10,15,20	<b>04:48PM</b> 240:10,15,20
<b>03:08PM</b> 184:20,25 185:5	<b>04:02PM</b> 211:25 212:5,10,15	<b>04:49PM</b> 240:25 241:5,10,15
<b>03:09PM</b> 185:10,15,20	<b>04:03PM</b> 212:20,25 213:5	<b>04:50PM</b> 241:20,25 242:5,10
<b>03:10PM</b> 185:25 186:5,10,15	<b>04:04PM</b> 213:10,15	<b>04:51PM</b> 242:15,20,25
<b>03:11PM</b> 186:20,25 187:5,10	<b>04:05PM</b> 213:20,25	<b>04:52PM</b> 243:5,10,15
<b>03:12PM</b> 187:15,20,25 188:5	<b>04:06PM</b> 214:10,15,20	<b>04:53PM</b> 243:20,25 244:5,10
188:10	<b>04:07PM</b> 214:25 215:5	<b>04:54PM</b> 244:15,20,25
<b>03:13PM</b> 188:15,20,25	<b>04:08PM</b> 215:10,15,20,25	<b>04:55PM</b> 245:5,10,15

**04:56PM** 245:20,25 246:5,10 **04:57PM** 246:15,20,25 247:5 247:10 **04:58PM** 247:20,25 248:5 **04:59PM** 248:10,15,20,25 **05:00PM** 249:5 **05:01PM** 249:10,15 **05:02PM** 249:20,25 250:5 **05:03PM** 250:10,15,20 **05:04PM** 250:25 251:5 **07** 10:6,7 **08** 178:18 **09:04AM** 4:5,10,15,20 **09:05AM** 5:5,10,15,20,25 6:5 **09:06AM** 6:10,15,20,25 **09:07AM** 7:5,10,15,20 **09:08AM** 7:25 8:5,10,15 **09:09AM** 8:20,25 9:5 **09:10AM** 9:10,15,20,25 **09:11AM** 10:5,10,15,20 **09:12AM** 10:25 11:5,10 **09:13AM** 11:15,20,25 12:5 **09:14AM** 12:10,15,20,25 **09:15AM** 13:5 **09:16AM** 13:10,15,20,25 **09:17AM** 14:5,10,15,20 **09:18AM** 14:25 15:5,10 **09:19AM** 15:15,20,25 16:5 **09:20AM** 16:10,15,20 **09:21AM** 16:25 17:5,10,15 17:20 **09:22AM** 17:25 18:5,10,15 **09:23AM** 18:20,25 19:5,10 **09:24AM** 19:15,20,25 20:5 **09:25AM** 20:10,15,20,25 **09:26AM** 21:5,10,15,20 **09:27AM** 21:25 22:5,10,15 **09:28AM** 22:20,25 23:5,10 **09:29AM** 23:15,20,25 **09:30AM** 24:5,10,15 **09:31AM** 24:20,25 25:5,10 **09:32AM** 25:15,20,25 **09:33AM** 26:5,10,15,20 **09:34AM** 26:25 27:5,10,15 **09:35AM** 27:20,25 28:5,10

**09:36AM** 28:15,20,25 **09:37AM** 29:5,10,15,20 **09:38AM** 29:25 30:5,10,15 **09:39AM** 30:20,25 31:5,10 **09:40AM** 31:15,20,25 32:5 **09:41AM** 32:10,15 **09:42AM** 32:20,25 33:5 **09:43AM** 33:10,15,20 **09:44AM** 33:25 34:5,10 **09:45AM** 34:15,20,25 **09:46AM** 35:5,10,15,20 **09:47AM** 35:25 36:5,10,15 **09:48AM** 36:20,25 37:5,10 **09:49AM** 37:15,20 38:5,10 **09:50AM** 38:15,20,25 39:5 **09:51AM** 39:10,15 **09:52AM** 39:20,25 40:5,10 **09:53AM** 40:15,20,25 **09:54AM** 41:5 **09:55AM** 41:10,15,20,25 42:5 **09:56AM** 42:10,15,20 **09:57AM** 42:25 43:5,10 **09:58AM** 43:15,20,25 **09:59AM** 44:5,10,15,20

## 1

**1** 13:9 14:11 117:11 128:4.6 128:14,18,25 130:17 141:2 141:8,12,17 142:10 151:15 202:20,23 239:22 240:1 **1.200** 100:19 **1,600** 100:20 **1.0** 224:19 234:15 242:24 245:17 **1.75** 169:12 **1:00** 106:16 **1:08** 106:21,23 **1:31** 123:4,8 **10** 168:2 195:7 205:25 225:6 225:13,16 226:8,8,11,12 244:21 **10B** 206:14 **10C** 206:10 213:15

**10D** 213:15

**10E** 213:15,18 **10:01** 44:23 **10:15** 44:25 **10:15AM** 45:5,10,15,20,25 **10:16** 45:3 **10:16AM** 46:5,10,15 **10:17AM** 46:20,25 47:5,10 **10:18AM** 47:15,20,25 48:5 **10:19AM** 48:10,15 **10:20AM** 48:20,25 49:5,10 **10:21AM** 49:15,20 **10:22AM** 49:25 50:5 **10:23AM** 50:10,15,20,25 **10:24AM** 51:5,10,15,20 **10:25AM** 51:25 52:5,10 **10:26AM** 52:15,20,25 **10:27AM** 53:5,10,15 **10:28AM** 53:20,25 54:5,10 **10:29AM** 54:15,20,25 55:5 **10:30AM** 55:10,15,20 **10:31AM** 55:25 56:5 **10:32AM** 56:10 **10:52AM** 56:15,20,25 57:5 57:10,15,20,25 58:5,10,15 58:20,25 59:5,10,15,20,25 60:5,10,15,20,25 61:5,10,15 61:20,25 62:5,10,15,20,25 63:5,10,15,20,25 64:5,10,15 64:20,25 65:5,10,15,20,25 66:5,10,15,20,25 67:5,10,20 67:25 68:5,10,15,20,25 69:5 **10:53AM** 69:15,20 **10:54AM** 69:25 70:5,10 **10:55AM** 70:15,20,25 **10:56AM** 71:5,10,15,20 **10:57AM** 71:25 72:5,10 **10:58AM** 72:15,20,25 **10:59AM** 73:5,10,15,20 **100** 2:10 40:4 61:23 62:5 142:23,25 156:4 238:16,17 238:25 248:14,16 249:1 **11** 103:19 212:17 218:2,15 220:18 **11.2** 197:4 **11:00AM** 73:25 74:5,10,15

	1	l
<b>11:01AM</b> 74:20,25 75:5,10	<b>11:48AM</b> 99:10,15,20	169:11 171:18 198:8 234:14
75:15	<b>11:49AM</b> 99:25 100:5,10	245:17
<b>11:02AM</b> 75:20,25 76:5	<b>11:50AM</b> 100:15,20,25 101:5	<b>2.0</b> 197:2
<b>11:03AM</b> 76:10,15,20,25	<b>11:51AM</b> 101:10,15	<b>2.2</b> 226:1
77:5	<b>11:52AM</b> 101:20,25 102:5,10	<b>2:15</b> 152:10,11
<b>11:04AM</b> 77:10,15,20	<b>11:53AM</b> 102:15,20,25	<b>2:22</b> 152:12,14
<b>11:05AM</b> 77:25 78:5,10,15	<b>11:54AM</b> 103:5,10	<b>20</b> 197:20 225:16,18 226:8,8
78:20	<b>11:55AM</b> 103:15,20,25	226:12
<b>11:06AM</b> 78:25 79:5,10,15	<b>11:56AM</b> 104:5,10,15,20	<b>200</b> 143:13 144:9 156:4,5
79:20,25	<b>11:57AM</b> 104:25 105:5	238:25
<b>11:07AM</b> 80:5,10,15,20,25	<b>11:58AM</b> 105:10,15,20,25	<b>200,000</b> 74:25
<b>11:08AM</b> 81:5,10,15,20	<b>11:59AM</b> 106:5,10,15,20	<b>2000</b> 2:23 154:18 155:13
<b>11:09AM</b> 81:25 82:5,10,15	<b>117</b> 93:7	<b>2001</b> 103:17,20,22
<b>11:10AM</b> 82:20,25 83:5,10	<b>119</b> 96:24	<b>2001-2004</b> 103:3
83:15	<b>12</b> 103:19 119:19 249:9	<b>2002</b> 103:20 109:14
<b>11:11AM</b> 83:20,25	<b>12:00</b> 106:19,20	<b>2004</b> 110:5 222:13
<b>11:12AM</b> 84:5,10,15	<b>121</b> 99:17	<b>2006</b> 7:20,24 8:8
<b>11:13AM</b> 84:20	<b>122</b> 101:15	<b>2007</b> 7:24
<b>11:14</b> 84:21,22	<b>126</b> 102:23	<b>2009</b> 1:18 4:5 252:9,18
<b>11:25AM</b> 84:25 85:5	<b>127</b> 103:12	253:23
<b>11:26</b> 84:23 85:1	<b>128</b> 104:25 105:24	<b>21st</b> 2:6
<b>11:26AM</b> 85:10,15,20,25	<b>13</b> 197:21	<b>211</b> 2:13
86:5	<b>132</b> 155:21,22	<b>212</b> 235:18
<b>11:27AM</b> 86:10,15	<b>137</b> 222:24	<b>221</b> 2:20
<b>11:28AM</b> 86:20,25 87:5,10	<b>140</b> 173:22,23	<b>23059</b> 2:23
<b>11:29AM</b> 87:15,20,25	<b>143</b> 156:18	<b>24</b> 65:23
<b>11:30AM</b> 88:5,10,15	<b>1492</b> 109:7	<b>25</b> 175:13 238:5,7,12,12
<b>11:31AM</b> 88:20,25 89:5	<b>1493</b> 111:7 114:15	<b>252</b> 3:7 253:16
<b>11:32AM</b> 89:10,15,20	<b>15</b> 103:21 104:3 239:23 240:1	<b>253</b> 3:7
<b>11:33AM</b> 89:25 90:5,10	<b>15th</b> 1:17 4:5	<b>26</b> 153:12 157:12
<b>11:34AM</b> 90:15,20,25	<b>16</b> 240:1	<b>268</b> 135:21
<b>11:35AM</b> 91:5,10,15,20,25	<b>170</b> 231:16,25 232:9	<b>272</b> 137:8
<b>11:36AM</b> 92:5,10,15	<b>180</b> 173:20	<b>274</b> 142:14
<b>11:37AM</b> 92:20	<b>19</b> 175:9,12 207:2,19 208:1	
<b>11:38AM</b> 92:25 93:5,10,15	208:20 209:14,20 211:3	3
<b>11:39AM</b> 93:20,25 94:5,10	19th 253:22	<b>3</b> 14:13 92:16 141:9,19 152:1
<b>11:40AM</b> 94:15,20,25 95:5	<b>1991</b> 106:2 175:9	166:18 167:11 168:6 198:24
<b>11:41AM</b> 95:10	<b>1992</b> 175:13	199:1
<b>11:42AM</b> 95:15,20,25 96:5	<b>1993</b> 175:16	<b>3A</b> 14:15
<b>11:43AM</b> 96:10,15,20	<b>1995</b> 117:4	<b>3F</b> 56:20
<b>11:44AM</b> 96:25 97:5	<b>1996</b> 133:25	<b>3,000</b> 39:6
<b>11:45AM</b> 97:10,15		<b>3:22</b> 195:1,2
<b>11:46AM</b> 97:20,25 98:5,10	2	<b>3:36</b> 195:3,5
98:15	<b>2</b> 57:21 99:18 128:5,7,7,25	<b>30</b> 35:13 36:11 39:6 139:1,14
<b>11:47AM</b> 98:20,25 99:5	141:9 142:10 151:15 152:1	140:21 141:3,6,13 225:18
,	I	

		I
225:20 226:8,9 232:18	<b>5C</b> 89:9,23 92:18	8
233:5,10,16	<b>5F</b> 132:3	<b>8</b> 132:10 196:17
<b>30,000-foot</b> 6:9,10	<b>5G</b> 132:10	<b>8.1</b> 165:11
<b>30-meter</b> 139:9	<b>5H</b> 152:17	<b>800</b> 100:19 101:13
<b>300</b> 35:13 36:11 221:4,6	<b>5th</b> 2:10	<b>89</b> 172:14 173:15
<b>300,000</b> 75:1	<b>5.9</b> 174:15	
<b>313</b> 2:6	<b>5:05</b> 251:3,5	9
<b>32</b> 235:15	<b>50</b> 134:3 238:13,16 239:5	<b>9</b> 164:21 214:16
<b>320</b> 2:16	248:12,12 249:1	<b>9:04</b> 4:2
<b>33</b> 103:1,8	<b>502</b> 2:4	<b>9:05</b> 4:5
<b>37</b> 165:5	<b>576</b> 198:24	<b>9:59</b> 44:24
<b>377</b> 167:3	<b>578</b> 202:15	<b>90</b> 172:14 173:16
<b>378</b> 166:14	<b>590</b> 184:19,22 220:22 221:7	<b>91</b> 172:17 175:5
<b>38</b> 206:16,23 208:8,15 209:21	250:16,18	<b>92</b> 172:17 175:5
209:22		<b>93</b> 172:17 175:5,24
<b>380</b> 171:17	6	<b>94</b> 172:19 173:25 175:24
<b>386</b> 180:2 187:6 253:24	<b>6</b> 63:12 65:7 85:10 87:2 89:25	<b>96</b> 134:8
<b>389</b> 169:10	117:20 152:16 164:20,21	<b>99</b> 172:19 173:25
<b>39</b> 175:19	222:22	
<b>39225</b> 2:24	<b>6E</b> 213:20,21	
	6th 2:4	
4	<b>6.4</b> 174:15	
<b>4</b> 22:22 54:18 107:10 108:21	<b>60</b> 134:4 142:21 143:7 144:5	
141:19 152:1 223:1,3	<b>65</b> 61:18 62:5 249:2	
<b>4A</b> 14:21	7	
<b>4B</b> 62:25	<b>7</b> 103:21 104:3 117:12,21,22	
4C 65:7 69:8,9	123:9 132:3 165:17 166:14	
4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ	179:22 218:2,6,15 244:24	
1:10	245:3	
<b>4:33</b> 233:24,25 <b>4:40</b> 234:1,3	<b>7B</b> 195:7 220:17	
*	<b>7C</b> 205:24	
<b>40</b> 103:2,8 143:12 144:8 168:2 197:22	<b>7E</b> 212:17	
<b>400</b> 2:10 100:18	<b>7H</b> 133:7	
<b>400,000</b> 75:1	<b>7-11</b> 218:16	
<b>403</b> 101:8,9	<b>7-11B</b> 220:17	
<b>45</b> 240:1	<b>7-11C</b> 249:9	
<b>46</b> 240:2	<b>700</b> 2:17	
70 270.2	<b>72701</b> 2:14,20	
5	<b>73105</b> 2:7	
<b>5</b> 3:5 56:8 63:1 85:8 133:11	<b>74103</b> 2:11,17	
135:14 152:2 166:1,6,11,22	<b>74119</b> 2:4	
169:15,17,20,21 170:5	<b>75</b> 240:2 243:1	
171:14 178:5,9,19 243:2	<b>76</b> 240:2	
<b>5B</b> 87:2		
	•	•

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his ) capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL ) OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and ) OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,) in his capacity as the TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES) FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, Plaintiff, )4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ vs. TYSON FOODS, INC., et al, Defendants.

## VOLUME II OF THE VIDEOTAPED

DEPOSITION OF FRANK COALE, PhD, produced as a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above styled and numbered cause, taken on the 16th day of January, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly certified under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oklahoma.

1	APPEARANCES	(Whereupon, the deposition began at
1 23 3 4 4	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Mr. Robert Nance	9:05 a.m.)
3	Mr. David Page	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the Record for
4	Attorneys at Law	Volume II of the deposition of Dr. Frank Coale.
	502 West 6th Street Tulsa, OK 74119	
<b>5</b> 6 6	Tuisa, OK 74119	Today is January 16th, 2009. The time is 9:05 a.m. 09:03AM
6	FOR CARGILL: Ms. Theresa Hill	Would counsel please identify themselves for the
7	Attorney at Law	Record?
8	100 West 5th Street Suite 400	MR. NANCE: Bob Nance for the State of
	Tulsa, OK 74103	
9 10	ruisu, Ort / 1105	Oklahoma.
10		MR. PAGE: David Page for the State of 09:03AM
11 11	FOR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel	Oklahoma.
12	Attorney at Law 320 South Boston	MR. McDANIEL: Scott McDaniel for Peterson
13	Suite 700	
13	Tulsa, OK 74103	Farms, Inc.
14		MR. TUCKER: K. C. Tucker for the George's
1 <u>4</u> 15	FOR GEORGE'S: Ms. K. C. Tucker	defendants. 09:04AM
16	Attorney at Law 221 North College	MS. HILL: Theresa Hill for the Cargill
	Fayetteville, AR 72701	
17	FOR CAL MAINTE. M. P. L. C. L.	defendants.
18	FOR CAL-MAINE: Mr. Robert Sanders Attorney at Law	VIDEOGRAPHER: And on the phone?
18	2000 AmSouth Plaza	MR. SANDERS: Bob Sanders for the Cal-Maine
20	P. O. Box 23059	defendants. 09:04AM
19 21	Jackson, MS 39225	
	(Via phone)	FRANK COALE, PhD
29 21 23		having first been duly sworn to testify the truth,
23		the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified
24		as follows:
24 24 25		CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
29	0.5.5	
	255	257
-11	INDEV	BY MR. NANCE:
1	INDEX	
2		Q Good morning, Dr. Coale.
3	WITNESS PAGE	A Good morning.
4	FRANK COALE, PhD	Q If you would take your report, which is
5	Continued Direct Examination by Mr. Nance 257	Exhibit 1 in front of you, and please turn to Page 09:04AM
6	Continued Direct Examination by Wir. Name: 257	12.
7	Signature Page 369	A Okay.
78	Reporter's Certificate 370	Q Let us let's look at the middle of that
8		Subparagraph D, which I guess is 7-11D, although
19)		it's on Page 12. About in the middle of that 09:04AM
110		paragraph there's a sentence which says, the
1 <u>12</u>		objective of the P index approach is not to conduct
1123		a quantitative analysis of the specific load, i.e.,
$1_{1}$ 34		pounds per acre, of phosphorus that will be
114		
115		to provide an estimate of the relative risk of P
116		loss when comparing multiple fields within a
178		watershed. Did I read that correctly?
1,8		A Yes, you did.
1,9		1
2.0		Q Okay. So the P index isn't supposed to tell 09:05AM
42 <u>4</u>		us how much phosphorus will wash off a particular
$2_{2}\frac{1}{2}$		field?
22	1	A That's correct.
<del>-</del> 27 <del>-23</del>		
<del>223</del> 23		
<sup>2</sup> 2 <sup>3</sup> 2 <sub>2</sub> 3 2.4		Q Okay, and the risk for P loss occurs because
<sup>223</sup> 2 <sub>2</sub> 3 24 25 25		
1 <sub>1</sub> 8 1 <sub>2</sub> 9 2 <sub>2</sub> 1 2 <sub>2</sub> 1 2 <sub>2</sub> 2 2 <sub>2</sub> 3 2 <sub>2</sub> 3 2 <sub>2</sub> 5 2 <sub>2</sub> 5 2 <sub>2</sub> 5	256	Q Okay, and the risk for P loss occurs because

1	amount that's agronomically needed?	in a watershed and saying, well, it's best to put
2	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	the litter on Field L or M instead of A or B?
3	A You can have a risk of P loss regardless of	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
4	how the land is managed, whether there's been	A Not that I know of.
5	phosphorus added to the farm field or not. 09:05AM	Q Okay. Are you aware of anyone that's doing 09:08AM
6	Q Okay, but a phosphorus index does a	that for the Illinois River watershed?
7	phosphorus index allow you to apply litter when the	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
8	agronomic need for phosphorus on a field has already	A No, I'm not.
9	been attained?	Q Are you able to express an opinion about the
10	A Some sites, that can be the outcome. Other 09:06AM	extent to which use of either Oklahoma Code 590 on 09:08AM
11	sites, it is not. It really depends on all the	our side of the border or the Arkansas phosphorus
12	factors you consider when going through a phosphorus	index on the Arkansas side of the border has reduced
13	index evaluation.	STP levels in the Illinois River watershed?
14	Q All right. When you say at the end of that	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
15	sentence that it's to estimate the relative risk of 09:06AM	A No, I can't. 09:08AM
16	P loss, what do you mean by relative risk?	Q Okay. Are you able to express an opinion
17	A When you take a particular site and you go	about the extent to which either Code 590 in
18	through the phosphorus index assessment, the outcome	Oklahoma or the Arkansas phosphorus index in
19	of that assessment is a numerical scale, and it's	Arkansas has improved water quality in the Illinois
20	roughly one to a hundred scale, and the higher the 09:06AM	River watershed? 09:09AM
21	value of that outcome is interpreted to be a higher	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
22	risk phosphorus loss from that site.	A No, I can't.
23	Q So would I be correct in concluding if you had	Q Do you know if anyone on behalf of the
24	two fields and Field A had an index of 80 and Field	defendants will opine either on reductions of STP or
25	B had an index of 50, the Field A would have a 09:06AM	improvement of water quality in the watershed 09:09AM
	259	261
1	higher relevant risk?	because of those two phosphorus indices?
_		
2	A That's correct.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
3	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.
3 4	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the
3 4 5	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM
3 4 5 6	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices
3 4 5 6 7	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common
3 4 5 6 7 8	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index,	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM  A Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.  Q Okay. Other than the farmer or the person	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM  A Yes.  Q Okay. Now, in your case study that is the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.  Q Okay. Other than the farmer or the person wanting to apply litter, is there anyone overall	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM A Yes. Q Okay. Now, in your case study that is the subject of Paragraph 8 and its subparts, you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.  Q Okay. Other than the farmer or the person wanting to apply litter, is there anyone overall comparing phosphorus index ratings within a whole	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM A Yes.  Q Okay. Now, in your case study that is the subject of Paragraph 8 and its subparts, you combined phosphorus index results from many sites
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.  Q Okay. Other than the farmer or the person wanting to apply litter, is there anyone overall comparing phosphorus index ratings within a whole watershed? 09:07AM	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM A Yes.  Q Okay. Now, in your case study that is the subject of Paragraph 8 and its subparts, you combined phosphorus index results from many sites and many watersheds in the state of Maryland? 09:10AM
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.  Q Okay. Other than the farmer or the person wanting to apply litter, is there anyone overall comparing phosphorus index ratings within a whole watershed? 09:07AM  A I'm not sure I understand the question.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM A Yes.  Q Okay. Now, in your case study that is the subject of Paragraph 8 and its subparts, you combined phosphorus index results from many sites and many watersheds in the state of Maryland? 09:10AM A Correct.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.  Q Okay. Other than the farmer or the person wanting to apply litter, is there anyone overall comparing phosphorus index ratings within a whole watershed? 09:07AM  A I'm not sure I understand the question.  Q Well, a farmer or someone who is wanting to	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM A Yes.  Q Okay. Now, in your case study that is the subject of Paragraph 8 and its subparts, you combined phosphorus index results from many sites and many watersheds in the state of Maryland? 09:10AM A Correct.  Q So that's your data there was just not
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.  Q Okay. Other than the farmer or the person wanting to apply litter, is there anyone overall comparing phosphorus index ratings within a whole watershed? 09:07AM  A I'm not sure I understand the question.  Q Well, a farmer or someone who is wanting to apply litter is going to look at Field A or Field B.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM A Yes.  Q Okay. Now, in your case study that is the subject of Paragraph 8 and its subparts, you combined phosphorus index results from many sites and many watersheds in the state of Maryland? 09:10AM A Correct.  Q So that's your data there was just not restricted to a particular watershed?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.  Q Okay. Other than the farmer or the person wanting to apply litter, is there anyone overall comparing phosphorus index ratings within a whole watershed? 09:07AM  A I'm not sure I understand the question.  Q Well, a farmer or someone who is wanting to apply litter is going to look at Field A or Field B.  A Right.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM  A Yes.  Q Okay. Now, in your case study that is the subject of Paragraph 8 and its subparts, you combined phosphorus index results from many sites and many watersheds in the state of Maryland? 09:10AM  A Correct.  Q So that's your data there was just not restricted to a particular watershed?  A No.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A That's correct.  Q You're comparing the risk between two fields?  A Correct.  Q Or between subfields in a particular field? 09:06AM  A Exactly right.  Q Okay. Is there any conceptual reason, Dr.  Coale, why you can't use it, the phosphorus index, to compare multiple fields between watersheds?  A It's meant to be used on a single field basis 09:07AM or subfield basis. So you wouldn't want to group multiple fields together.  Q But if Field A were in one watershed and Field B were in another, is there any reason why you can't compare the relative risk between those two fields? 09:07AM  A That would be valid.  Q Okay. Other than the farmer or the person wanting to apply litter, is there anyone overall comparing phosphorus index ratings within a whole watershed? 09:07AM  A I'm not sure I understand the question.  Q Well, a farmer or someone who is wanting to apply litter is going to look at Field A or Field B.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I have no knowledge of that.  Q In I guess it's Paragraph 8A there at the bottom on Page 12, you say that there's a common set 09:09AM of principles that underpin phosphorus indices nationwide, paraphrasing. What are the common principles that exist between Oklahoma, Arkansas and Maryland in the phosphorus indices?  A The common principles that are in all of 09:10AM those, they incorporate an assessment of the phosphorus source characteristics and the transport characteristics, and combine those two assessments and give an overall risk evaluation.  Q Okay, and all of them do those things? 09:10AM A Yes.  Q Okay. Now, in your case study that is the subject of Paragraph 8 and its subparts, you combined phosphorus index results from many sites and many watersheds in the state of Maryland? 09:10AM A Correct.  Q So that's your data there was just not restricted to a particular watershed?

1		
1	phosphorus index to do that in Maryland?	each other. That three times the agronomic limit
2	MR. McDANIEL: I object to the form.	environmental threshold was established by state
3	A Well, we did that to demonstrate how it would	policy as a threshold that if a soil test phosphorus
4	perform over a wide landscape. That was the	level of a certain fields is above that threshold,
5	purpose. 09:11AM	then that site must be assessed by the phosphorus 09:13AM
6	Q And would it presumably also apply over a wide	site index.
7	landscape in Oklahoma or Arkansas?	Q Okay, and that was some sort of legal or
8	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	political decision made by policymakers?
9	A I believe you could apply an index over a wide	A Correct.
10	landscape and have a similar distribution analysis. 09:11AM	Q Okay, but the environmental threshold where 09:14AM
11	Q Okay, and even though that might embrace	you must use it is three times agronomically?
12	numerous watersheds in either Oklahoma or Arkansas?	A By state policy.
13	A Watersheds are composed of subwatersheds, and	Q By state policy?
14	it depends on where you draw the boundary, yes, sir.	A State regs, yes.
15	Q Well, for purposes of my question, I'm asking 09:11AM	Q Is there any empirical scientific basis that 09:14AM
16	for watersheds bigger than the Illinois River	says more bad things happen above that three times
17	watershed, the adjoining watersheds in either state.	limit than happen below it?
18	A And that's something I don't have any	A Well, that limit was set based on some data
19	knowledge how the physical topography changes. For	that was available showing that at roughly it was
20	example, there's a certain place across the 09:11AM	a very rough dataset roughly at that level you 09:14AM
21	landscape where the soils type soil types may	tend to see an acceleration in soluble P in soils.
22	change dramatically, may run from an acidic soil to	Q So am I hearing you correctly that above that
23	a calcareous type soil as you work west, and I don't	limit roughly
24	know how large the landscape is or where that	A Right.
25	boundary would be. So there's some fundamental 09:12AM	Q there is an even greater concentration in 09:14AM
	263	265
-	Control of the Park of the	es e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
1	factors there that the P index that you are	runoff of soluble P than below it?
2	utilizing wouldn't be the appropriate one to use if	A I didn't say runoff. It's just soluble soil
3	you cross a certain physical characteristic boundary	P, which is different than runoff soluble soil
<b>4</b> 5	in the landscape.  Q And if you cross such a boundary, would you 09:12AM	soluble P.   Q What's the effect of the runoff soluble P   09:15AM
6	Q And if you cross such a boundary, would you 09:12AM need to somehow adjust the index to account for the	
U		~
7	·	above and below the limit?
7 8	difference?	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of
8	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from
8 9	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P
8 9 L0	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and 09:12AM	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff.  09:15AM
8 9 10	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff.  Q And does the line somewhere near that point
8 9 10 11	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas,	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff.  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?
8 9 10 11 12	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and 09:12AM Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff.  O 9:15AM  O And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.
8 9 10 11 12 13	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff.  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and 09:12AM Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff.  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.  Q Okay.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and 09:12AM Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.  Q Okay. Are you aware of any regulatory effort 09:12AM	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff.  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.  Q Okay.  (Whereupon, a discussion was held off
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.  Q Okay. Are you aware of any regulatory effort in Oklahoma to establish an environmental threshold	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff. 09:15AM  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.  Q Okay.  (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the Record.)
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.  Q Okay. Are you aware of any regulatory effort in Oklahoma to establish an environmental threshold that is three times the 65 pound per acre agronomic	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff. 09:15AM  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.  Q Okay.  (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the Record.)  Q Do I understand correctly, Dr. Coale, that at
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.  Q Okay. Are you aware of any regulatory effort in Oklahoma to establish an environmental threshold that is three times the 65 pound per acre agronomic limit in Oklahoma?	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff. 09:15AM  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.  Q Okay.  (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the Record.)  Q Do I understand correctly, Dr. Coale, that at double, triple or quadruple the agronomic limit,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and Oblahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.  Q Okay. Are you aware of any regulatory effort in Oklahoma to establish an environmental threshold that is three times the 65 pound per acre agronomic limit in Oklahoma?  A No, I'm not.	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff. 09:15AM  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.  Q Okay.  (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the Record.)  Q Do I understand correctly, Dr. Coale, that at double, triple or quadruple the agronomic limit, you're not going to get any more response from
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and O9:12AM Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.  Q Okay. Are you aware of any regulatory effort in Oklahoma to establish an environmental threshold that is three times the 65 pound per acre agronomic limit in Oklahoma?  A No, I'm not.  Q And for purposes of the Maryland site 09:13AM	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff. 09:15AM  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.  Q Okay.  (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the Record.)  Q Do I understand correctly, Dr. Coale, that at double, triple or quadruple the agronomic limit, you're not going to get any more response from phosphorus, from adding additional phosphorus? 09:15AM
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and O9:12AM Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.  Q Okay. Are you aware of any regulatory effort in Oklahoma to establish an environmental threshold that is three times the 65 pound per acre agronomic limit in Oklahoma?  A No, I'm not.  Q And for purposes of the Maryland site 09:13AM phosphorus index, however it goes	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff.  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.  Q Okay.  (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the Record.)  Q Do I understand correctly, Dr. Coale, that at double, triple or quadruple the agronomic limit, you're not going to get any more response from phosphorus, from adding additional phosphorus?  O9:15AM  A Response in what?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and O9:12AM Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.  Q Okay. Are you aware of any regulatory effort in Oklahoma to establish an environmental threshold that is three times the 65 pound per acre agronomic limit in Oklahoma?  A No, I'm not.  Q And for purposes of the Maryland site 09:13AM phosphorus index, however it goes  A Correct.	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff.  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly.  Q Okay.  (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the Record.)  Q Do I understand correctly, Dr. Coale, that at double, triple or quadruple the agronomic limit, you're not going to get any more response from phosphorus, from adding additional phosphorus?  O In forage.
8	difference?  A It would have to be accounted for.  Q Okay. I think we talked yesterday about the recognized agronomic limits in Maryland and O9:12AM Oklahoma. I don't recall if we talked about what the agronomic limit is considered to be in Arkansas, and if we did, I apologize, but let me ask you that.  A I don't recall what it is.  Q Okay. Are you aware of any regulatory effort in Oklahoma to establish an environmental threshold that is three times the 65 pound per acre agronomic limit in Oklahoma?  A No, I'm not.  Q And for purposes of the Maryland site 09:13AM phosphorus index, however it goes  A Correct.  Q you consider high P to be three times your	above and below the limit?  A If there if you have a higher level of soluble soil P and you have runoff generated from that site, you would expect to have higher soluble P in the runoff. 09:15AM  Q And does the line somewhere near that point get steeper?  A Exactly. Q Okay. (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the Record.)  Q Do I understand correctly, Dr. Coale, that at double, triple or quadruple the agronomic limit, you're not going to get any more response from phosphorus, from adding additional phosphorus? 09:15AM  A Response in what? Q In forage.  A In crop production, crop growth?

1	Q Okay. That's what the agronomic limit means?	A That would be using the Oklahoma
2	A That's how it's defined.	conversion, yes, sir.
3	Q Okay. Does the State of Arkansas have an	Q Okay, and if in the nutrient limited watershed
4	environmental threshold for phosphorus?	of the Illinois River
5	A That I don't know. 09:16AM	A Uh-huh. 09:19AM
6	Q You don't know how it works in their	Q there was a 300-pound per acre limit
7	phosphorus index?	A Limit to
8	A I haven't studied that deeply, no, sir.	Q phosphorus application?
9	Q Okay. Is it permissible in Maryland to use	A So you can't put any more phosphorus on the
10	the Maryland site phosphorus index below the 09:16AM	land? 09:19AM
11	environmental limit or threshold?	Q Correct. That's your understanding of what
12	A Yes, absolutely.	our 590 says, isn't it?
13	Q You gave me some figures yesterday on how you	A That's my understanding, yes, sir.
14	broke out the categories in the Maryland phosphorus	Q Okay. None of those 292 applications would be
15	index. Where would 65 pounds per acre fit in your 09:16AM	allowed in the Illinois River watershed, would they? 09:19AM
16	categories of low, medium, optimum and excessive?	A Using the Oklahoma 590 standard with its to
17	A Okay. Now, those categories of low, medium,	make sure I'm understanding everything correctly,
18	-	
19	optimum and excessive we talked about yesterday were	with the limitation drawn at 300 pounds per acre, that equates to all of these sites. So all these
20	not phosphorus site index categories. Those were soil test lab report categories. 09:17AM	sites would be not would not be permitted to 09:20AM
21	and the company of th	
	Q Okay, and I'm wondering where from the soil	apply phosphorus on those sites.
22	test lab result of 65 pounds per acre would fit in	Q And using your phosphorus index on these on
23 24	those categories?	the data on these sites, how many or what percentage
	A Well, 65 pounds per acre, using the Oklahoma conversion, would be, what, 32 and a half parts per 09:17AM	of these sites in Maryland could receive additional
25	, ,	litter?
	267	209
1	million.	A 94 percent.
2	Q Sounds good to me.	Q Okay. Let's just go through each of these
3	A I believe it's a factor of half.	categories so I understand a little better. The low
4	Q Right.	category, which represents 55 percent of the
5	A So it would be 32 and a half, which would be 09:17AM	samples 09:20AM
6	in the medium category.	A Correct.
7	Q Let's look at Figure 2 on Page 13 of your	Q what would the litter application rate be
8	report. This is a result of, do I understand	for those low samples under your Maryland site
9	correctly, 646 different PI applications	index?
10	A Correct. 09:18AM	A It would be the rate that was necessary to 09:20AM
11	Q in the state of Maryland?	supply the nitrogen demand of the crop. So it would
12	A Correct.	be the nitrogen-based rate.
13	Q And it includes both sites that are above and	Q Would the application rate be for the medium
14	below the environmental threshold?	category, which is 25 percent of the sites?
15	A Correct. 09:18AM	A That would be it's a transitional phase in 09:21AM
16	Q Let's turn over to Page 15 and look at Figure	the medium where you would without looking at my
17	3. How does Figure 3 differ from Figure 2?	reference, I hope I get this right. You can apply
18	A This is a subset. This data is a subset of	nitrogen-based rate one year or two years and then
19	data that's in Figure 2.	the phosphorus-based rate one or two years out of a
	data tilat s ili Figure 2.	the phosphorus cused rate one of two years out of a
20	Q And is it a subset of the phosphorus index 09:19AM	three-year cycle, and that's why I'm hesitating 09:21AM
20	Q And is it a subset of the phosphorus index 09:19AM	three-year cycle, and that's why I'm hesitating 09:21AM
20 21	Q And is it a subset of the phosphorus index applications where the soil test P exceeded 150	three-year cycle, and that's why I'm hesitating 09:21AM whether it's one year or two years, but some years
20 21 22	Q And is it a subset of the phosphorus index applications where the soil test P exceeded 150 milligrams per kilogram?	three-year cycle, and that's why I'm hesitating 09:21AM whether it's one year or two years, but some years you apply nitrogen rate and some years you apply a
20 21 22 23	Q And is it a subset of the phosphorus index applications where the soil test P exceeded 150 milligrams per kilogram?  A That's correct.	three-year cycle, and that's why I'm hesitating 09:21AM whether it's one year or two years, but some years you apply nitrogen rate and some years you apply a phosphorus-based rate in a three-year crop cycle.
20 21 22 23 24	Q And is it a subset of the phosphorus index 09:19AM applications where the soil test P exceeded 150 milligrams per kilogram? A That's correct. Q And for those of us who speak Oklahoman, that	three-year cycle, and that's why I'm hesitating 09:21AM whether it's one year or two years, but some years you apply nitrogen rate and some years you apply a phosphorus-based rate in a three-year crop cycle.  Q Okay. What about the high category, which is

1	A That would be the the rate would	holding you to what Oklahoma water quality standards
2	be dependent the rate is limited to a phosphorus	are or Arkansas.
3	removal rate, a phosphorus-based rate.	MR. McDANIEL: Again, I object. It's
4	Q And explain to me very simply how you figure	outside the scope of his report.
5	out phosphorus removal. 09:21AM	A Okay. Not being a limnologist, not being a 09:25AM
6	A It would be the rate of phosphorus that's	surface water biologist, I just don't want to go in
7	expected to be removed from the harvested crop, by	that area. I don't feel comfortable with that.
8	the harvested crop, and that's harvested and removed	Q Is that something you teach your students in
9	from the field. The amount of phosphorus we harvest	your environmental science classes?
10	it with is the amount you should be able to apply. 09:22AM	A No. 09:25AM
11	Q And the point of that would be to keep the	Q You don't teach them that?
12	phosphorus at least in balance?	A Casual concepts but nothing very specific.
13	A To keep it steady, yes, sir.	Q Well, let's deal with it at the level of
14	Q Then what could be applied in terms of litter	casual concepts that you teach your environmental
15	in the very high category, which is 6 percent? 09:22AM	science students at the University of Maryland. 09:25AM
16	A There would be no application.	A Okay.
17	Q For those 75 percent of these samples, which	Q If we were to decrease the STPs in the land of
18	are either low or medium, would you expect that the	the Illinois River watershed, would you expect that
19	application of litter would increase the STP?	to have a water quality benefit to the waters of the
20	MR. McDANIEL: I think it's 80 percent. 09:23AM	watershed? 09:25AM
21		
22	A It's 80 percent. I was just checking the math.	MR. McDANIEL: I still object. You're
23		badgering him trying to get him to form an opinion
24		in an area for which he's not been offered in this
	A All right. 80 percent, I would expect if you applied litter on those sites, the STP would 09:23AM	case. It's been pointed out to you twice already.
25		Q Let me reframe the question, Dr. Coale. If we 09:25AM
	271	273
1	increase.	were to reduce the STP levels in the watershed on
2	Q Okay. Is there any phosphorus index, Dr.	the level of what you teach your students at the
3	Coale, which exists, which would achieve what you do	University of Maryland, would you expect to decrease
4	in the high category, which is balance inputs with	the P levels in the water of the Illinois River
5	removals, on a whole watershed basis? 09:23AM	watershed? 09:26AM
6	A Not that I'm aware of.	MR. McDANIEL: It's the same objection.
7	Q And if something existed in your field, you	It's outside the scope of his report.
8	would be aware of that, wouldn't you?	A What we hopefully get across to the students
9	A It's a high probability.	is the importance of knowing how any nutrient or any
10	Q Okay. Speaking in the very broad strokes, Dr. 09:24AM	substance that you're interested in is transported 09:26AM
11	Coale, would you expect water quality in the	across a watershed, and if the substance you're
12	Illinois River watershed to improve if the STPs in	interested in, whether it be phosphorus or nitrogen
13	the watershed decreased?	or some industrial chemical or whatever it is, is
14	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's	moved from where it is deposited through the
15	outside of the scope of the opinions offered in this 09:24AM	landscape and into the water and it's been 09:26AM
16	report.	documented that it can have an ecological impact in
17	A I don't have an opinion on that.	the water, the important thing the students need to
18	Q Are you telling me that because you haven't	know is if it was moved across the landscape and
19	been asked to form an opinion by the defendants or	transported from where it's deposited into the water
20	just because you don't know? 09:24AM	and it's been documented that it can have an 09:27AM
21	A No. I don't understand the water quality	ecological impact, that you need to understand the
22	parameters in the watershed here.	source, the transport and the impact, all three
23	Q I'm not asking about our water quality	phases of the system. Okay? If I don't know any
24	standards or anything like that. I'm just asking	one of those three phases, I don't know if it's
25		_
	about the quality of the water generally. I'm not 09:25AM	going to have an impact or not. That's the level of 09:27AM
23	about the quality of the water generally. I'm not 09:25AM 272	going to have an impact or not. That's the level of 09:27AM 274

1	concept you would present it at.	become almost useless.
2	Q Okay. Thinking of it at the PhD level where	Q What about in the Illinois River watershed?
3	you are	A I would from what I know about the
4	A Okay.	precipitation patterns, which is just casual
5	Q if you diminish the STPs in the Illinois 09:27AM	observation of data in that area, I expect they 09:30AM
6	River watershed, would you expect that to diminish	would have very limited usability.
7	the amount of phosphorus in the water of the	Q Explain then what you how you form your
8	Illinois River watershed?	nitrogen target, as it were, for what you need to
9	MR. McDANIEL: Just a second. Bob, you've	apply.
10	asked him like six different times around this 09:27AM	A In those situations you're usually basing your 09:30AM
11	question. I've told you he's not being presented as	nitrogen application rate based on the expected
12	a water quality expert, and it's inappropriate for	productivity or the yield goal or the expected
13	you to try to ask him to create opinions about the	growth that the crop is going to have, and from
14	Illinois River watershed that he hasn't placed in	calibrated research studies, you say if you are
15	his report. It's the fifth time now. I'll ask you 09:27AM	going to grow X tons of grass forage, you are 09:30AM
16	to stop because you're arguing with and trying to	probably going to need so many pounds of nitrogen to
17	badger this witness, and it's not appropriate.	produce that.
18	MR. NANCE: No, I'm not. I'm just asking	Q Okay. Let's look briefly at Figure 4 on Page
19	him, as the expert, if he has an opinion on whether	16 of your report, sir. Is this a subset of your
20	lower STPs in the soil will result in lower 09:28AM	original Figure 2, which includes sites that had a 09:31AM
21	phosphorus in the water.	soil test phosphorus of less than 150 milligrams per
22	MR. McDANIEL: And he's answered your	kilogram?
23	question by saying he's not qualified, doesn't have	A That's what this says, yes.
24	the information, can't answer it, and you haven't	Q And so this would be, speaking Oklahoman, less
25	accepted it. That's my problem. 09:28AM	than 300 pounds per acre 09:31AM
	275	277
1	Are you not qualified to encuer that question?	A Correct
1 2	Q Are you not qualified to answer that question? Δ That's true	A Correct.
2	A That's true.	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you
2	A That's true. Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in
2 3 4	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4
2 3 4 5	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can 09:28AM	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM
2 3 4	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the
2 3 4 5 6	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can 09:28AM find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can 09:28AM find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, 09:29AM	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen concentrations in the soil are so dynamic and 09:29AM	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have fewer high risk soils being 4 percent below 150 09:32AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen concentrations in the soil are so dynamic and 09:29AM variable and transient, that it's very difficult to	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have fewer high risk soils being 4 percent below 150 09:32AM versus 15 percent above 150?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen concentrations in the soil are so dynamic and variable and transient, that it's very difficult to take a planting time frame soil sample for nitrogen	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have fewer high risk soils being 4 percent below 150 09:32AM versus 15 percent above 150?  A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen concentrations in the soil are so dynamic and variable and transient, that it's very difficult to take a planting time frame soil sample for nitrogen and project how I should plan my management of that	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have fewer high risk soils being 4 percent below 150 09:32AM versus 15 percent above 150?  A Yes.  Q And you also have about half as many in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen concentrations in the soil are so dynamic and variable and transient, that it's very difficult to take a planting time frame soil sample for nitrogen and project how I should plan my management of that field according to that sample.	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have fewer high risk soils being 4 percent below 150 09:32AM versus 15 percent above 150?  A Yes.  Q And you also have about half as many in the very high category when your STP is below 150; is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen concentrations in the soil are so dynamic and variable and transient, that it's very difficult to take a planting time frame soil sample for nitrogen and project how I should plan my management of that field according to that sample.  Q Are there nitrogen soil tests that are useful 09:29AM	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have fewer high risk soils being 4 percent below 150 09:32AM versus 15 percent above 150?  A Yes.  Q And you also have about half as many in the very high category when your STP is below 150; is that right? 09:32AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen concentrations in the soil are so dynamic and variable and transient, that it's very difficult to take a planting time frame soil sample for nitrogen and project how I should plan my management of that field according to that sample.  Q Are there nitrogen soil tests that are useful in planning one year out?	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have fewer high risk soils being 4 percent below 150 09:32AM versus 15 percent above 150?  A Yes.  Q And you also have about half as many in the very high category when your STP is below 150; is that right? 09:32AM  A That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen concentrations in the soil are so dynamic and variable and transient, that it's very difficult to take a planting time frame soil sample for nitrogen and project how I should plan my management of that field according to that sample.  Q Are there nitrogen soil tests that are useful in planning one year out?  A It really depends on the more rainfall a site	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have fewer high risk soils being 4 percent below 150 09:32AM versus 15 percent above 150?  A Yes.  Q And you also have about half as many in the very high category when your STP is below 150; is that right? 09:32AM  A That's correct.  Q 3 versus 6 percent?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A That's true.  Q Okay. You said something I think earlier in your report about nitrogen tests not being reliable or something like that. Do you recall that? We can find it if we need to, but I just want to know what your view of nitrogen soil testing is.  A In the conventional concept of soil testing where you test the soil before you are making a management decision to see how much, for example, phosphorus, to see how much soil test phosphorus is in the soil, use that information to make management about what I want to do over the future, a year, two years or whatever it might be. Nitrogen concentrations in the soil are so dynamic and variable and transient, that it's very difficult to take a planting time frame soil sample for nitrogen and project how I should plan my management of that field according to that sample.  Q Are there nitrogen soil tests that are useful in planning one year out?  A It really depends on the more rainfall a site receives, the less useful they become. In more dry,	Q of phosphorus? Okay. To what do you attribute the fact that there are more sites in terms of percentage in the low category of Figure 4 than Figure 3? 09:31AM  A Well, the only overarching differences is the soil test P levels.  Q I notice that you have, I guess, fewer in the medium category below 150 milligrams per kilogram than you did above. Am I reading that correctly? 09:32AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Comparing 13 and 25 percent?  A Correct.  Q 13 being the lower STP level. You also have fewer high risk soils being 4 percent below 150 09:32AM versus 15 percent above 150?  A Yes.  Q And you also have about half as many in the very high category when your STP is below 150; is that right? 09:32AM  A That's correct.  Q 3 versus 6 percent?  A That's right.

scra.4.7 website. Can you help me figure out where Maguire says that because I looked on the website, and from on article I found not article, and I'll show you the article I found. It's the one we talked about at the preliminary injunction hearing. Is this the O9:33AM article that you're talking about there where the preliminary injunction hearing?  A A quick read through this article, I don't see it. O9:37AM Q Did the substance of what you wrote change as one cling paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long paragraph. I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it is one long par		
or transport components used to identify the critical source areas for P losses would be negligent, and then you cite Magnire, sup that because I looked on the website, and I flound one article, and I'll show you the article I found. It's the one we talked about at the article I found, It's the one we talked about at the article I found, It's the one we talked about at a separate copy of the same thing.  A A quick read through this article, I don't see I it. 09:33AM as a separate copy of the same thing.  A A quick read through this article, I don't see I it. 09:37AM a louint see I given either source or transport components?  A Not that I'm aware of. 09:37AM agoing either source or transport components?  A I may be my word.  A I mit may be my interpretation of his writing.  A I mit may be my interpretation of his writing.  A I mit have been in this gabout. 09:33AM at least that word suggested to you have have not ransport components?  A I may be my word.  A I m	you say, the scientific community has reached	A The attorneys I was working with.
critical source areas for P losses would be pegligent, and then you cite Maguire, et al, and the SERA-17 website. Can you help me figure out where Maguire says that because I looked on the website, and I found one article, and I'll show you the article I found. It's the one we failled about at the preliminary injunction hearing, Is this the 10 the preliminary injunction hearing, Is this the 11 article that you're talking about there where 12 Maguire says it would be negligent? That's just a 13 separate copy of the same thing, 14 A quick read through this article, I don't see 15 ii. (9:37AM 16 Q Well, and I'll tell you I didn't see it 16 vither. Is there some other article by Maguire 17 where he says that if would be negligent to blindly 18 gipore either source or transport components? 19 A to that I'm aware of. 09:37AM 20 So is the word negligent your word or is it 21 Maguire's word? 22 Maguire's word? 23 A I may be my word. 24 Q Olay, Is there anything preventing you from 25 knowing whether it's your word or not? 26 A Title is Phosphorus Indices to Predict the 27 C Olay, Dr. Onde, negligent strikes me as a 28 U Olay, Dr. Onde, negligent strikes me as a 29 lawyeword rather than a soll scientist word. Was 20 that word suggested to you by a lawyer? 21 A I may be my our remember discussing that article 22 with me during the preliminary injunction hearing; 23 O Olay, Dr. Onde, negligent strikes me as a 24 lawyew row ord rather than a soll scientist word. Was 27 O Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin? 28 that word suggested to you by a lawyer? 29 A Tou came up with that all on your own? 30 Q How many expert reports have you prepared in 31 you career? 32 A O May dut and under the preliminary injunction hearing? 33 O Olay, Dr. Onde, negligent strikes me as a 34 lawyer ord rather than a soll scientist word. Was 35 that word suggested to you by a lawyer? 36 A Title is Phosphorus Indices to Predict the 37 O Olay, Dr. Onde, negligent strikes me as a 38 O Olay. Dr. Onde, negligent strikes me as a 39 O Olay. Dr. Onde, ne	consensus that to blindly ignore either the source	Q And who were those attorneys?
5 negligent, and then you cite Maguire, et al, and the 9:33AM A There were some conference calls where there Maguire says that because I looked on the website, and I found one article, and I'll show you the article I found. It's the one we talked about at the perliminary injunction hearing. I stifts the 1 the perliminary injunction hearing. I stifts the 1 stift of the article copy of the same thing.  4 A quick read through this article, I don't see it. 99:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 99:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 99:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 99:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 99:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 99:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 99:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I didn't see it. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'll tell you will not may are of. 109:37AM and I'l	or transport components used to identify the	A Mainly from Mr. McDaniel.
SERA-17 website. Can you help me figure out where Maguire says that because I looked on the website, and I found one article, and I'll show you the urticle I found. It's the one we talked about at the preliminary injunction hearing. Is this the Maguire says it would be negligent? That's just a separate copy of the same thing, it. 09:37AM A A quick read drough this article, I don't see thit. 09:37AM Well, I believe when I first made my first one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so we could reference section by section more clearly. Q bid the substance of what you wrote change as we're the says that if would be negligent to blindly grove either source or transport components? Q So is the word negligent your word or is it Maguire's word? A Not that I'm aware of. 09:37AM Q So is the word negligent your word or is it Maguire's word? A Not that I'm aware of. 09:37AM Q So is the word negligent your word or is it Maguire's word? A I'm ay be my word.  A I may be my word.  A I may be my interpretation of his writing.  A I — it may be my interpretation of his writing.  A I — it may be my interpretation of his writing.  A I — it may be my interpretation of his writing.  A I defice the article we've been talking about? I can make it an exhibit if we want to. 09:37AM Q Okay. Do ur remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction bearing? A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM Q Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer out rather than a soll scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer? A No, sir. Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences. A Noe. Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences. Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences. Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences. Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences. Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences. Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those	critical source areas for P losses would be	Q Any other attorneys?
Maguire says that because I looked on the website, and I found one article, and I'll show you the article I found. It's the one we talked about at the preliminary injunction hearing. Is this the 1.0 the preliminary injunction hearing. Is this the 1.1 article that you're talking about there where 1.2 Maguire says it would be negligent? That's just a separate copy of the same thing. 1.4 A Quick read through this article, I don't see 1.5 i. 1. 09:37AM 1.6 Q Well, and I'll tell you I didn't see it 1.7 either. Is there some other article by Maguire 1.8 where he says that it would be negligent to blindly 1.9 ignore either source or transport components? 1.0 Q So is the word negligent your word or is it 1.0 Q Well, and I'll tell you read into the Record just the 1.0 d I'll tell you read into the Record just the 1.1 d I'll tell you read into the Record just the 1.1 d I'll tell you read into the Record just the 1.1 d I'll tell you read into	negligent, and then you cite Maguire, et al, and the 09:33AM	A There were some conference calls where there 09:38AM
and I found one article, and I'll show you the riticle I found. It's the one we talked about at the preliminary injunction hearing. Is this the displayed by the preliminary of the want to display the word registed to you by a lawyer?  A I refer that you're talking about there where  Well. I believe when I first made my first to dy 39 A draft of it, my first cut of it, it was essentially one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up one long paragraph format to make it so we could reference section by section more clearly.  Q Well and I was unterested to blead would and unterested an	SERA-17 website. Can you help me figure out where	were multiple attorneys on the line, and I'm not
nrticle I found. It's the one we talked about at the preliminary injunction hearing. Is this the operation of his working. Is this the operation of his principal that you're talking about there where draft of it, my first cut of it, it was essentially one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so it. Operation were clearly one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so it. Operation were clearly one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so it. Operation were clearly one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it we could reference section by section more clearly.  A lit was advised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph formats to when the conference with was a dark and that you was deal and tartits?  A lit may be my word.  Q Okay. Is there anythi	Maguire says that because I looked on the website,	sure all of them who were on the line.
the preliminary injunction hearing. Is this the  definition of talking about there where  article that you're talking about the you article to make it so we could reference section by section more clearly.  Q Did the substance of what you wrote change as 09:  you went through drafts?  A A felicted it, yes, sir.  Q Did any lawyer help you edit it?  A We had — in a couple of instances had web conferences and looked at drafts, and I got feedback ops:  a writing.  A It may be my word.  Q Okay. Is there anything preventing you from and looked at drafts, and I got feedback ops:  a writing.  A It may be my interpretation of his  article article we've been talking about? I  article article we've been talking about? I  A I — it may be my interpretation of his  article article we've been talking about? I  A Title is Phosphorus Indices to Predict the  can make it an exhibit if we want to.  90 You came up with that all on your own?  90 You came up with that all on your own?  90 You came up with that all on your own?  90 You came up with that all on your own?  90 You came up with that all on your own?  90 You came up with that all on your own?  90 You want through drafts?  A Re bad in, the substance of what you wrote that it would be resulted to make it so own condenses that whe conference was suggestions made that, you know, this i	and I found one article, and I'll show you the	Q Was it Mr. McDaniel that told you the format
article that you're talking about there where  Maguire says it would be negligent? That's just a  separate copy of the same thing.  A A quick read through this article, I don't see  it. 09:37AM  Q Well, and I'll tell you I didn't see it  either. Is there some other article by Maguire  where he says that it would be negligent to blindly  gipore either source or transport components?  A Not that I'm aware of. 09:37AM  Q So is the word negligent your word or is it  Maguire's word?  A I may be my word.  Q Oaly. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not?  A Title if the article we've been talking about? I can nake it an exhibit if we want to.  Q Olay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I can nake it an exhibit if we want to.  Q Olay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A The lieve we did talk about it.  Q Olay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word arther than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A Noe.  A One.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences of that you know of?  draft of it, my first cut of it, it was essentially one long paragraph, and I was divised to break it up into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so we could reference section by section more clearly.  Q Did the substance of what you wreat change a we could reference section by section more clearly.  Q Did the substance of what you wreat change a wou went through drafts?  A We had — in a couple of instances had web conferences and looked at drafts, and I god feedback of on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general body audience and, yes, there was suggestions made that, you know, this is a clear message, this is not a clear message, and I would adjust it from there.  Q Olay. By my interpretation of his writing.  A I was may first every eiter with that as well. It wa	article I found. It's the one we talked about at	to use?
Maguire says it would be negligent? That's just a separate copy of the same thing.  A A quick read through this article, I don't see it.  Description of the same thing.  Og. Well, and I'll tell you I didn't see it.  Were he says that it would be negligent to blindly ignore either source or transport components?  A Not that I'm aware of.  Og. 37AM  Og. Did any lawyer help you edit it?  A Not that I'm aware of.  Og. 37AM  Og. Did any lawyer help you edit it?  A We had – in a couple of instances had web conferences and looked at draffis, and I got feedback.  Og. Os is the word negligent your word or is it.  Maguire's word?  A It may be my word.  In may be my interpretation of his writing.  A I — it may be my interpretation of his writing.  Og. Olay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I can make it an exhibit if we want to.  Og. Olay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I can make it an exhibit if we want to.  Og. Olay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A I believe we did talk about it.  Og. Olay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, Sir.  Og. Vou came up with that all on your own?  Og. Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those conferences:  Og. Was Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those conferences:  Og. Was Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those conferences:  Og. Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences:  Og. Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences:  Og. Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences:  Og. Was Mr. anyone on those conferences:  Og. Was Mr. a	the preliminary injunction hearing. Is this the 09:33AM	A Well, I believe when I first made my first 09:39AM
separate copy of the same thing.  A A quick read through this article, I don't see it. 09:37AM  O Well, and I'll tell you I didn't see it either. Is there some other article by Maguire where he says that it would be negligent to blindly jegnore either source or transport components?  A Not that I'm aware of. 09:37AM  O So is the word negligent your word or is it Maguire's word?  A Not that I'm aware of. 09:37AM  O Okay. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not? 09:37AM  A I — it may be my interpretation of his writing.  O Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I can make it an exhibit if we want to. 09:37AM  A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM  O Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  O You came up with that all on your own? 09:38AM that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A One.  O A da that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  Into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so we could reference section by section more clearly.  O Did the substance of what you wrote change as you went through drafts?  A As I edited it, yes, sir.  O Did any lawyer help you edit it?  A We had — in a couple of instances had web conferences and looked at drafts, and I got feedback 09:30 on whether with I was writing made sense to a more general body audience and, yes, there was a general body audience a	article that you're talking about there where	draft of it, my first cut of it, it was essentially
A A quick read through this article, I don't see it. 09:37AM Q Well, and I'll tell you I didn't see it either. Is there some other article by Maguire where he says that it would be negligent to blindly gipore either source or transport components? A Not that I'm aware of. 09:37AM Q So is the word negligent your word or is it Maguire's word? A I tray be my word. Q Okay. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not? 09:37AM 279  A I — it may be my interpretation of his writing. Q Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? 1 can make it an exhibit if we want to. Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing? A I believe we did talk about it. Q Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer? A No, sir. Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career? A One. Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  we could reference section by section more clearly. Q Did the substance of what you wrote change as you went through drafts? A As led tine, ts, sir. Q Did any lawyer help you edit it? A Me had — in a couple of instances had web conferences and looked at drafts, and I got feedback on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general body audience and, yes, there was suggestions made that, you know, this is a clear message, this is not a clear message, and I would adjust it from there.  09:39AM 279  281  Q Okay. Tell me what you mean when you say you had a web conference.  A It was my first experience with that as well. It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to — I would bring document said.  Q Who was on that conference with you?  A I believe we did talk about it.  Q Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin?  A I believe there were.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those conferences: Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences: Q Was Mr. Ro	Maguire says it would be negligent? That's just a	one long paragraph, and I was advised to break it up
5 ii. 09:37AM 6 Q Well, and I'll tell you I didn't see it 7 either. Is there some other article by Maguire 8 where he says that it would be negligent to blindly 9 ignore either source or transport components? 1 Q So is the word negligent your word or is it 2 Maguire's word? 3 A It may be my word. 4 Q Okay. Is there amything preventing you from 8 knowing whether it's your word or not? 5 knowing whether it's your word or not? 6 Q Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I 6 can make it an exhibit if we want to. 6 A Title is Phosphorus Losses. 8 Q Okay. Would you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing? 6 A No, sir. 7 Q You came up with that all on your own? 8 A To leive we did talk about it. 9 Q You came up with that all on your own? 9 Q You came up with that all on your own? 9 Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those conferences on that would be the one we're talking about 9 ignore either. Is there some other article by Maguire word or file of the word in the want of the word or file of the word in the want of the want on the preventing you from whether what I was writing made sense to a more general body audience and, yes, there was suggestions made that, you know, this is a clear message, this is not a clear message, and I would adjust it from there. 9 Q Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I two words and web conference. A It was my first experience with that as well. It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to – I would bring document up on my conducted the words and webe conference. A I know Mr. McDaniel was. I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each of them and there were different people on each of them and there were different people on each of them and there were different people on each of them and there were different p	separate copy of the same thing.	into an outline-type paragraph format to make it so
Q Well, and I'll tell you I didn't see it either. Is there some other article by Maguire where he says that it would be negligent to blindly ignore either source or transport components?   Q Did any lawyer help you edit it?   A Not that I'm aware of.   09:37AM   0	1	we could reference section by section more clearly.
Section   Color   Co	it. 09:37AM	O Did the substance of what you wrote change as 09:39AM
cither. Is there some other article by Maguire where he says that it would be negligent to blindly gnore either source or transport components? A Not that I'm aware of. Og. 37AM Og. So is the word negligent your word or is it Maguire's word? A It may be my word. Og. Okay. Is there anything preventing you from Is mowing whether it's your word or not? Og. 37AM Og. Okay. Is there anything preventing you from Is mowing whether it's your word or not? Og. 37AM Og. Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I can make it an exhibit if we want to. Og. Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing? A I believe we did talk about it. Og. Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer? A No, sir. Og. How many expert reports have you prepared in your career? A One. Og. And that would be the one we're talking about Og. And that would be the one we're talking about Og. And that would be the one we're talking about Og. And that would be the one we're talking about Og. And that would be the one we're talking about Og. And that would be the one we're talking about Og. And that would be the one we're talking about Og. And that would be the one we're talking about Og. And that would be the one we're talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking about Og. And that would be the one of the talking of the talking about Og. And that would b	O Well, and I'll tell you I didn't see it	1 -
where he says that it would be negligent to blindly ignore either source or transport components?  A Not that I'm aware of. 09:37AM conferences and looked at drafts, and I got feedback 09:30 on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general body audience and, yes, there was suggestions made that, you know, this is a clear message, this is not a clear message. The subject to the adjust it from there.  A I was my first experience with that as well.  It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to — I would bring document up on my of the ability to — I would bring document up on my of the mature of the ability to — I would bring document up on my of the ma	302 302 300 300 300 300 300 300 300 300	1.
gore either source or transport components?  A Not that I'm aware of.  O So is the word negligent your word or is it  Maguire's word?  A It may be my word.  O Okay. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not?  O Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I the title of the article we've been talking about it.  O Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A No. sir.  O Okay. Do you came up with that all on your own?  O How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A We had in a couple of instances had web conferences and looked at drafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book and trafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book and trafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book and trafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book and trafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book and trafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book and trafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book and trafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book at drafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book at drafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book at drafts, and I got feedback 09:3  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general book at drafts, and I got feedback 09:3  operal body audience and, ops, there was a geget in message, and I would adjust it from three.  O Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article with that as well.  It was called a WebEx, where a		1,7
O A Not that I'm aware of. O So is the word negligent your word or is it Maguire's word? A It may be my word. O Okay. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not? O Way. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not? O Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I the an make it an exhibit if we want to. O Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing? A I believe we did talk about it. O Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer? A No. sir. O How many expert reports have you prepared in your carver? A One. O Q And that would be the one we're talking about to with me duding? O Can that I'm aware of. O Osis the word negligent your word or is it on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general body audience and, yes, there was suggestions made that, you know, this is a clear message, this is not a clear message, and I would adjust it from there. O Okay. Tell me what you mean when you say you had a web conference. A It was my first experience with that as well. It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to — I would bring document up on my O9-40 could see what was — my document up on my O9-40 could see what was — my document said.  Q Who was on that conference with you? A I know Mr. McDaniel was I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each O9-40 imme.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers? A Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers? A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those conferences.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences. O Was there anyone on those conferences one-conferences one-conferences. O Was there anyone on those conferences one-conferences one-conferences. O Was there anyone on those conferences one-conferences. O Was there anyone on those conferences.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
O So is the word negligent your word or is it Maguire's word? A It may be my word.  O Okay. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not?  O Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I can make it an exhibit if we want to.  O Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I can make it an exhibit if we want to.  O Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  O How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  O And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM of today?  on whether what I was writing made sense to a more general body audience and, yes, there was suggestions made that, you know, this is a clear message, this is not a clear message, and I would adjust it from there.  O Okay. It may be my word.  O Okay. Tell me what you mean when you say you had a web conference.  A It was my first experience with that as well.  It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to — I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to — I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to — I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to — I would bring document who over was in on that web conference could see what was — my document said.  Q Who was on that conference with you?  A I know Mr. McDaniel was. I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each 19:34 time.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those events.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences:  9 A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about 19:38AM 10 was there anyone on those conferences 19:4 today?		·
Maguire's word?  A It may be my word.  Q Okay. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not?  Okay. Is there anything preventing you from writing.  A I it may be my interpretation of his writing.  Q Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I title is Phosphorus Indices to Predict the Risk For Phosphorus Losses.  Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A I believe we did talk about it.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  general body audience and, yes, there was suggestions made that, you know, this is a clear message, this is not a clear message, and I would adjust it from there.  90:39AM  281  Q Okay. Tell me what you mean when you say you had a web conference.  A It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to - I would bring document up on my 09:44 computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was — my document said.  Q Who was on that conference with you?  A I know Mr. McDaniel was. I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each 109:3  time.  Q Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin?  A Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those events.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 109:4  representing Cargill that you know of?		, ,
A It may be my word.  Q Okay. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not?  279  Q Okay. Is there anything preventing you from 279  A I — it may be my interpretation of his writing.  Q Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I the ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44  A Title is Phosphorus Losses.  Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q You came up with that all on your own?  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  I twas alled a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:44 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 ability to—I would bring document up on my 09:48 abili		
4 Q Okay. Is there anything preventing you from knowing whether it's your word or not? 09:37AM 279 281  1 A I — it may be my interpretation of his writing. 3 Q Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I twas called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to — I would bring document up on my 09:46 A Title is Phosphorus Losses. 4 Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing? 5 A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM that word suggested to you by a lawyer? 6 A No, sir. Q You came up with that all on your own? 09:38AM A Yes, sir. Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career? 9 A One. Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  1 Delieve we did that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  2 Was there anything preventing you from message, this is not a clear message, and I would adjust it from there. 09:39AM 281  2 Residue it from there. 09:39AM adjust it from there. 09:39AM 281  2 Q Okay. Tell me what you mean when you say you had a web conference.  A It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to — I would bring document up on my 09:40 computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was — my document said.  Q Who was on that conference with you?  A I know Mr. McDaniel was. I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each time.  Q Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin?  A I believe there were.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Mr. Jorgensen one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40 conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40 conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.		
knowing whether it's your word or not? 279 281  A I — it may be my interpretation of his writing. Q Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I can make it an exhibit if we want to. 09:37AM A Title is Phosphorus Indices to Predict the Risk For Phosphorus Losses. Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing? A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM O Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer? A No, sir. Q You came up with that all on your own? A Now many expert reports have you prepared in your career? A One. Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM to today?  A I — it may be my interpretation not? Q Okay. Tell me what you mean when you say you had a web conference. 09:39AM 281  Q Okay. Tell me what you mean when you say you had a web conference. 09:39AM  Q Okay. Tell me what you mean when you say you had a web conference. 09:39AM A It was my first experience with that as well. It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to — I would bring document up on my 09:40 computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was — my document up on my 09:40 computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was — my document said. Q Who was on that conference with you? A I know Mr. McDaniel was. I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each 109:4 time.  Q Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin? A I believe there were. Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers? A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those 109:40 computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was — my document up on my 09:40 time. Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those 109:40 computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was — my document up on my 09:40 time. Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those 109:40 Computer and whoever was in on that web conference 109:4		
279  A I it may be my interpretation of his writing.  Q Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to - I would bring document up on my 09:40 computer and whoever was in on that web conference.  A It was my first experience with that as well. It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to - I would bring document up on my 09:40 computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was - my document said.  Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM of them and there were different people on each 09:40 time.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q You came up with that all on your own? 09:38AM of A Yes, sir.  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?	Q stage and any and provide a great and a	
writing.  Q Okay. Would you read into the Record just the title of the article we've been talking about? I  Can make it an exhibit if we want to.  Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A I believe we did talk about it.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q You came up with that all on your own?  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A I had a web conference.  A It was my first experience with that as well.  It was called a WebEx, where a website hosted the ability to — I would bring document up on my 09:40 computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was — my document said.  Q Who was on that conference with you?  A I know Mr. McDaniel was. I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each 09:40 time.  Q Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin?  A I believe there were.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A I believe there were.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those op:40 words.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40 words.		1 3
can make it an exhibit if we want to.  4 Title is Phosphorus Indices to Predict the Risk For Phosphorus Losses.  5 Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  6 A I believe we did talk about it. CO Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was  12 that word suggested to you by a lawyer? 13 A No, sir. CO You came up with that all on your own? 14 A Yes, sir. CO How many expert reports have you prepared in your career? 15 Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career? 16 A One. 17 Q And that would be the one we're talking about 109:38AM today?  18 daility to — I would bring document up on my computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was — my document said.  Q Who was on that conference with you?  A I know Mr. McDaniel was. I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each of time.  Q Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin?  A I believe there were.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences of 9:40 today?	writing.	had a web conference.
ability to I would bring document up on my op:40  A Title is Phosphorus Indices to Predict the Risk For Phosphorus Losses.  Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM of them and there were different people on each 09:40 time.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q You came up with that all on your own? 09:38AM of them and there were different people on each 09:40 that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those lowyers?  A Yes, sir.  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40 today?	1	1
A Title is Phosphorus Indices to Predict the Risk For Phosphorus Losses.  Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A I believe we did talk about it.  O Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q You came up with that all on your own?  A Yes, sir.  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  computer and whoever was in on that web conference could see what was my document said.  Q Who was on that conference with you?  A I know Mr. McDaniel was. I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each 09:40 time.  Q Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin?  A I believe there were.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those one one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40 today?	_	· ·
Risk For Phosphorus Losses.  Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM of them and there were different people on each 09:40 of them and there were different people on each 109:40 of them and there were different people on each 109:40 of them and there were different people on each 109:40 of them and there were different peo		
Q Okay. Do you remember discussing that article with me during the preliminary injunction hearing? A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM of them and there were different people on each 09:40 Q Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer? A No, sir. Q You came up with that all on your own? 09:38AM A Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers? A Yes, sir. Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career? A One. Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40 today?	•	1 -
with me during the preliminary injunction hearing?  A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM of them and there were different people on each time.  Dokay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  D You came up with that all on your own? 09:38AM A Yes, sir.  D How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  D And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  A I know Mr. McDaniel was. I believe we had two of them and there were different people on each time.  D Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin?  A I believe there were.  D Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those events.  D Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  D Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40 today?		
A I believe we did talk about it. 09:38AM of them and there were different people on each 09:4  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was lawyer word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir. Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Yes, sir. Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those your career?  A One. Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  A I believe there were different people on each 09:40 time.  Q Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin?  A I believe there were.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those events.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40 today?		T -
Q Okay. Dr. Coale, negligent strikes me as a lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Yes, sir.  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about today?  time.  Q Were there lawyers from Sidley & Austin?  A I believe there were.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those events.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences op:40 today?		of them and there were different people on each 09:40AM
lawyer word rather than a soil scientist word. Was that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  A Yes, sir.  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about today?  Q Was Mr. Bobert George on one or more of those conferences op:40  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences op:40  R That I specifically can't remember.		1 1
that word suggested to you by a lawyer?  A No, sir.  Q You came up with that all on your own?  A Yes, sir.  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about today?  A I believe there were.  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers?  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40  P Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40  P Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40		
A No, sir.  Q You came up with that all on your own? A Yes, sir.  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career? A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about today?  Q Was Mr. Jorgensen one of those lawyers? A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those opens.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences opens.		
Q You came up with that all on your own? 09:38AM A Mr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those o9:40 A Yes, sir. events.  How many expert reports have you prepared in your career? A One. A That I specifically can't remember.  A That I specifically can't remember.  A That I specifically can't remember.  A Wr. Jorgensen was on at least one of those events.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:40  The conference of those events.		
A Yes, sir.  Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about today?  events.  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:4  representing Cargill that you know of?		
Q How many expert reports have you prepared in your career?  A One.  Q And that would be the one we're talking about today?  Q Was Mr. Robert George on one or more of those conferences?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences 09:4  representing Cargill that you know of?		
8 your career? 9 A One. O And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM today?  Conferences? A That I specifically can't remember. O Was there anyone on those conferences 09:4 representing Cargill that you know of?		
9 A One. 0 Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM Q Was there anyone on those conferences 109:4 today?  A That I specifically can't remember.  Q Was there anyone on those conferences representing Cargill that you know of?	2	
Q And that would be the one we're talking about 09:38AM Q Was there anyone on those conferences today?  Q And that would be the one we're talking about representing Cargill that you know of?	'	
today? representing Cargill that you know of?		1
		1
A 100 that I know oil. I probably don't know who		
Q How did you know how to prepare that report? was representing whom on any of those conference		
44 A I asked a lot of questions. was representing whom on any or those conference calls.		
Q To whom did you ask them? 09:38AM Q Mr. John Tucker? 09:41AM	•	
280 282		

1	A I don't recognize that name.	Q Did Dr. Dicks ask you to generate numbers or	
2	Q Mr. Bruce Jones?	estimates of your own?	
3	A Don't recognize that name either.	A No, sir.	
4	Q Dr. Coale, did any other experts comment on	Q So did he then ask you if some estimate he had	
5	your report, either on these WebEx conferences or 09:42AM	generated sounded reasonable to you?	09:45AM
6	otherwise?	A It was more not the number he generated. It	
7	A Not that I recall. Again, I don't I might	was more he asked my opinion on whether the process	
8	not even recognize the names of who was on I may	or the logic he was using to make the calculations	
9	not have known who was on there, but not that I	seemed sound, and that's what I basically did.	
10	recall, not that I paid attention to anyway. 09:42AM	Q Which calculations are you talking about?	09:45AM
11	Q Do you recall any other expert being on those	A I believe in my report I mentioned there was	
12	calls, anyone you recognized not being a lawyer?	certain sections of his expert report that I saw in	
13	A Okay. Again, there were a couple of these	a draft form, and he asked whether the assumptions	
14	WebEx and then there was a couple of conference	they were using, as economists, to make assumptions	
15	calls that we had about the document being shared, 09:42AM	about soil phosphorus dynamics, whether those were	09:45AM
16	and what I'm having difficulty doing on the spot	sound assumptions, and I basically read through	0,11,01
17	here is remembering who was on which of those	those two separate sections of his document and read	
18	events. However, I did have a conversation on one	through them and gave him my opinion whether I	
19	of those events. Billy Clay was in a conversation;	thought it was sound assumptions or not.	
20	Mike Dicks was in a conversation, and those are the 09:43AM	Q Okay. Just to distinguish, did he ask you	09:46AM
21	only two individual names that I believe to be other	to what assumptions should I use or did he say	
22	experts in this case that I can remember.	this is my assumption, is it reasonable?	
23	Q What did Dr. Clay say in whatever conference	A Oh, he asked me the latter. Asked me, you	
24	he was on?	know, this is how we're going to approach it, does	
25	A My general recollection was that he was just 09:43AM	that make sense, and I said seems like that was a	09:46AM
	283	285	
1	answering questions about characteristics of the IRW that I didn't really understand, you know, what's	pretty good assumption, again, for his purpose, for an economic analysis, which I never saw that.	
3	the average farm look like, what's a typical	Q Yesterday morning Mr. McDaniel gave me a	
4	operation, more on-the-ground descriptive so I could	couple of documents, which have been Bates labeled	
5	get a mental picture of the farming situations since 09:43AM	Coale 000281 through 283 excuse me, 284. Let me	09:46AM
6	I had never been there, and that's mainly my what	hand that to you and see if you recognize that.	
7	I gleaned from his conversation.	A That appears to be one of the segments of Dr.	
8	Q Okay. What about Dr. Dicks; what did he say	Dicks' draft report that I reviewed for him.	
9	when he was participating?	Q Okay. Did you see any earlier version of that	
10	A We had a call I believe I spoke with him 09:44AM	document? 09:47AM	
11	twice, mainly in regard to he was doing an economic	A I only saw it one time.	
12	assessment and had some questions from me about,	Q And it's that one; right?	
13	from a soil scientist perspective, whether some of	A As far as I remember, it looked just like	
14	the procedures and processes he was going through	this.	
15	made sense to me as a soil scientist, and that was 09:44AM	Q Okay. Let me show you another document that	09:47AM
16	the gist of that conversation.	Mr. McDaniel gave me for the first time yesterday,	
17	Q And what was he asking you as a soil	which has been Bates numbered by him Coale 000285	
18	scientist?	through 292, and let me see if you recognize that	
19	A Some basic questions about soil test P and	document.	
20	forages and application rates and fertilizer rates 09:44AM		09:47AM
21	and, you know, crop removal rates and those kind of	from Dr. Dicks' report that I was asked to review.	
22	things, and did this sound like an reasonable	Q Did you ever see any earlier or later version	
23	estimate, does this sound like a reasonable	of that?	
24	estimate, did you make this assumption, could you	A No, sir, just the one.	00.1=11
25	make that assumption, just kind of a very general. 09:44AM	MR. NANCE: Scott, could we make copies in	09:47AM
	284	286	

a minute and admit those?	this case.
MR. McDANIEL: Uh-huh. I may have an extra	A This doesn't look familiar.
set here you can go ahead and mark, and then we can	Q Okay. Would I be safe in concluding that
make copies for the other counsel if you want to.	you're not going to offer any testimony at trial on
Q Dr. Coale, let me hand you first what I've 09:48AM	the first two pages of Exhibit 12 or the subject 09:53AM
marked as Exhibit No. 10, and that's the document	matter therein?
that has Bates 281 through 284, and ask you if	MR. McDANIEL: All right. Will you hold
that's one of the Clay documents that you looked at	off answering your question just a second and give
to form your report.	me a chance to look at this
A I don't know what you mean by Clay document. 09:49AM	MR. NANCE: Certainly. 09:53AM
Q Excuse me, Dicks document.	MR. McDANIEL: and then let me object
A I thought you meant like a soil document.	to the form simply because there are embedded
Yeah, this is one of the ones I saw of Dr. Dicks'	farming concepts within this discussion that you
documents.	have touched on with Dr. Coale. If the question is
Q All right, and is what I marked as Exhibit 11 09:49AM	will he be speaking in terms of this economic 09:54AM
the other document that you looked at from Dr. Dicks	analysis or budgets on a poultry farm that Dr. Dicks
to help fix your report in this case?	is opining about, I don't object to that question,
A Yes, sir.	but to say he doesn't offer an opinion on anything
Q Are these the documents that you refer to in	discussed in this section, I do object to the form
your expert report in Paragraphs 10C and D on Page 09:49AM	of that question. 09:54AM
17?	Q Then let's reask the question. Dr. Coale, do
A Yes, sir.	you anticipate offering any testimony on the poultry
Q Dr. Coale, I prepared some exhibits that are	forage and beef cattle budgets that are discussed in
from the final report of Rausser and Dicks rather	the first two pages of Exhibit 12?
than these draft reports. Let me think if there's 09:50AM	A No, I don't anticipate doing that. 09:54AM
287	289
	0 70 14 70 14 14 14 14 14
any way MR. NANCE: Scott, do you know if those	Q Then let's flip over to the third page, which
MR. NANCE: Scott, do you know if those	is Appendix A. You are going to speak about topics
changed materially between the draft and the final?	that are in there, are you not?
MR. McDANIEL: It's my impression they	A Give me a chance to look at it, please.
didn't, but if there was some individual grammatical 09:51AM	
	Q Please do. 09:55AM
or my impression is there's no substantive	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A
	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of 09:51AM	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and 09:56AM
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking,	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking,	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development.  09:51AM	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A,
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development.  09:51AM  Dr. Coale, let me hand you what I've marked as	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A, which may be a little different than Exhibit 10. 09:56AM
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development.  09:51AM  Dr. Coale, let me hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 12. When I was reading your report	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A, which may be a little different than Exhibit 10. 09:56AM A Correct.
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development.  09:51AM  Dr. Coale, let me hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 12. When I was reading your report	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A, which may be a little different than Exhibit 10. 09:56AM A Correct.  Q Okay. As we walk through that part of Exhibit
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development.  09:51AM  Dr. Coale, let me hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 12. When I was reading your report let me explain. You referred to Section E, and I	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A, which may be a little different than Exhibit 10. 09:56AM A Correct.  Q Okay. As we walk through that part of Exhibit A, which excuse me, Exhibit 12, which is Appendix
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development.  09:51AM  Dr. Coale, let me hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 12. When I was reading your report let me explain. You referred to Section E, and I think I have put as the first two pages of Exhibit	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A, which may be a little different than Exhibit 10. 09:56AM A Correct.  Q Okay. As we walk through that part of Exhibit A, which excuse me, Exhibit 12, which is Appendix A, if you see something different or that's been
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development. 09:51AM  Dr. Coale, let me hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 12. When I was reading your report let me explain. You referred to Section E, and I think I have put as the first two pages of Exhibit 12 a different Section E than you looked at. So let 09:52AM me ask	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A, which may be a little different than Exhibit 10. 09:56AM A Correct.  Q Okay. As we walk through that part of Exhibit A, which excuse me, Exhibit 12, which is Appendix A, if you see something different or that's been changed in your recollection since you did the 09:56AM
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development. 09:51AM  Dr. Coale, let me hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 12. When I was reading your report let me explain. You referred to Section E, and I think I have put as the first two pages of Exhibit 12 a different Section E than you looked at. So let 09:52AM me ask	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A, which may be a little different than Exhibit 10. 09:56AM A Correct.  Q Okay. As we walk through that part of Exhibit A, which excuse me, Exhibit 12, which is Appendix A, if you see something different or that's been changed in your recollection since you did the initial review, would you let me know, please?
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development. 09:51AM  Dr. Coale, let me hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 12. When I was reading your report let me explain. You referred to Section E, and I think I have put as the first two pages of Exhibit 12 a different Section E than you looked at. So let me ask A It looks different.	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A, which may be a little different than Exhibit 10. 09:56AM A Correct.  Q Okay. As we walk through that part of Exhibit A, which excuse me, Exhibit 12, which is Appendix A, if you see something different or that's been changed in your recollection since you did the initial review, would you let me know, please?  A If I catch it, I will.
change, but I can't sit here and tell you there hasn't been a word changed or something like that.  Q Since I've highlighted mine, I'm going to go ahead and we may have two very similar sets of exhibits here, but I'm going to go ahead and put these in, and this one may take a little thinking, but this one when I prepared it, I didn't understand the situation as well as I do in light of the new development. 09:51AM  Dr. Coale, let me hand you what I've marked as Exhibit No. 12. When I was reading your report let me explain. You referred to Section E, and I think I have put as the first two pages of Exhibit 12 a different Section E than you looked at. So let me ask  A It looks different. Q Yeah. Look at the first two pages of Exhibit	A Just from a quick comparison, this looks to be the same or close to the same as the Appendix A document I reference in my report.  Q Okay, and in your report in Paragraph 10C on Page 17 you say, I have reviewed Section E and Appendix A; is that right?  A Correct.  Q And Exhibit 12 looks like I will represent to you is the final report version of Appendix A, which may be a little different than Exhibit 10. 09:56AM A Correct.  Q Okay. As we walk through that part of Exhibit A, which excuse me, Exhibit 12, which is Appendix A, if you see something different or that's been changed in your recollection since you did the initial review, would you let me know, please?  A If I catch it, I will.  Q Okay. Now, let me ask you first to tell me

to Historical Litter Production and Parameters	
	information that he reviewed and included in his
Specified by Literature and Soil Consultants.	report and is prepared to testify about, which is
Q Okay. Very broad brush to start out with, Dr.	that covered in Coale Exhibits 10 and 11, you're
Coale. Were you involved in the front end of	correct.
designing this particular methodology? 09:57AM	Q Dr. Coale, I'm looking on Exhibit 12, so let's 10:12AM
A No, sir.	make sure we're all on the same literal page, the
Q Were you rather involved either in the middle	Appendix A portion of Exhibit 12. Do you have that
or on the back end in offering opinions as to the	in front of you?
adequacy or the correctness of the methodology?	A Just a moment. Okay.
A It was offered to me in this form and with the 09:57AM	Q Tell me once again at the 30,000-foot level 10:13AM
understanding that this was these were	what it was that Dr. Dicks was doing in Appendix 12.
assumptions and methodology used by Dr. Dicks to	A The way it was presented to me was that they
develop an economic assessment, and I've worked with	were trying to do an economic analysis of production
agricultural economists over the years, and they're	systems in the IRW, and what they needed to do to do
they frequent times need to have people with 09:58AM	that analysis was to formulate a scenario they could 10:13AM
expertise outside of their economics world to say is	analyze, and they had to make some generalization
this a fair assessment, is it a fair assumption, is	and some approximations and some judgments, and they
this a fair approximation, and my role was to read	asked whether the ones they made were pertinent to
through this and advise them if they had made any	my expertise of soil science were whether I
technical blunders, if they had made fair 09:58AM	agreed with the methodology we were using to develop 10:13AN
assessments, fair assumptions and if their logic was	their approach, and that's basically what I did.
sound, and that's what my role was.	Q Okay. So you're not opining that his economic
Q All right, and as a result of reading through	methodology is sound, are you?
the draft, which I think is Exhibit 10, did you	A No.
advise Dr. Dicks to make any changes in his work as 09:58AM	Q Do you know if Dr. Dicks called upon any other 10:14AM
291	293
it would appear in the final form?	agricultural-related expert I guess he mentions
A No. I believe my comment to him was his	Dr. Clay besides you and Dr. Clay to help him do
assumptions looked sound to me.	the work in Appendix A?
Q Okay, and did you tell him that his	A I don't know.
methodology looked sound to you? 09:58AM	
-	Q Okay, but you're not 10:14AM
A Of those words, yes.	Q Okay, but you're not 10:14AM  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?
<ul><li>A Of those words, yes.</li><li>Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we</li></ul>	Q Okay, but you're not 10:14AM  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a	Q Okay, but you're not 10:14AM  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we	Q Okay, but you're not 10:14AM  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say  Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM	Q Okay, but you're not 10:14AM  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say  Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if 10:14AM.
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.	Q Okay, but you're not 10:14AM  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say  Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.	Q Okay, but you're not 10:14AM  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say  Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if 10:14AM you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m.	Q Okay, but you're not  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say  Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if  you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m.  (Following a short recess at 10:00	Q Okay, but you're not  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say  Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if  you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to be a mess and suggest as far as that work product, that you can really separate them. All right?
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM  VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m.  (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13	Q Okay, but you're not  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say  Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if  you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want  to break them up. I just don't what our Record to  be a mess and suggest as far as that work product,  that you can really separate them. All right?
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record. The time is 10:00 a.m.  (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13 a.m.) 10:11AM	Q Okay, but you're not  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say  Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if  you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want  to break them up. I just don't what our Record to  be a mess and suggest as far as that work product,  that you can really separate them. All right?  Q Dr. Coale, did you ever talk to Dr. Rausser?  10:14AM
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m.  (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13 a.m.) 10:11AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.	Q Okay, but you're not  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to be a mess and suggest as far as that work product, that you can really separate them. All right?  Q Dr. Coale, did you ever talk to Dr. Rausser?  10:14AM A Not that I know of.
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m. (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13 a.m.) 10:11AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:13 a.m.	Q Okay, but you're not MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to be a mess and suggest as far as that work product, that you can really separate them. All right?  Q Dr. Coale, did you ever talk to Dr. Rausser?  A Not that I know of.  Q Okay. Unless he was one of those people on a
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m. (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13 a.m.) 10:11AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:13 a.m.  MR. NANCE: Scott, before we go on, you and	Q Okay, but you're not MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr. Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to be a mess and suggest as far as that work product, that you can really separate them. All right?  Q Dr. Coale, did you ever talk to Dr. Rausser?  A Not that I know of.  Q Okay. Unless he was one of those people on a conference call or a WebEx that you can't name?  A Correct.
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m. (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13 a.m.) 10:11AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:13 a.m. MR. NANCE: Scott, before we go on, you and I had a discussion while we were off the Record	Q Okay, but you're not MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr. Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to be a mess and suggest as far as that work product, that you can really separate them. All right?  Q Dr. Coale, did you ever talk to Dr. Rausser?  A Not that I know of.  Q Okay. Unless he was one of those people on a conference call or a WebEx that you can't name?  A Correct.
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m. (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13 a.m.) 10:11AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:13 a.m. MR. NANCE: Scott, before we go on, you and I had a discussion while we were off the Record about the fact that Rausser and Dicks marked their 10:12AM	Q Okay, but you're not MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr. Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to be a mess and suggest as far as that work product, that you can really separate them. All right?  Q Dr. Coale, did you ever talk to Dr. Rausser?  A Not that I know of.  Q Okay. Unless he was one of those people on a conference call or a WebEx that you can't name?  A Correct.  Q Did you ever have any E-mail correspondence
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m. (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13 a.m.) 10:11AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:13 a.m. MR. NANCE: Scott, before we go on, you and I had a discussion while we were off the Record about the fact that Rausser and Dicks marked their 10:12AM report confidential, and let me ask you to confirm	Q Okay, but you're not  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to be a mess and suggest as far as that work product, that you can really separate them. All right?  Q Dr. Coale, did you ever talk to Dr. Rausser?  A Not that I know of.  Q Okay. Unless he was one of those people on a conference call or a WebEx that you can't name?  A Correct.  Q Did you ever have any E-mail correspondence with Dr. Rausser or snail mail correspondence for
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m. (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13 a.m.) 10:11AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:13 a.m. MR. NANCE: Scott, before we go on, you and I had a discussion while we were off the Record about the fact that Rausser and Dicks marked their 10:12AM report confidential, and let me ask you to confirm that as far as we're going to be examining Dr. Coale	Q Okay, but you're not  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to be a mess and suggest as far as that work product, that you can really separate them. All right?  Q Dr. Coale, did you ever talk to Dr. Rausser?  A Not that I know of.  Q Okay. Unless he was one of those people on a conference call or a WebEx that you can't name?  A Correct.  Q Did you ever have any E-mail correspondence with Dr. Rausser or snail mail correspondence for that matter?
A Of those words, yes.  Q Before we launch into this, Dr. Coale, we probably need to change tapes and maybe have a comfort break if that's agreeable.  A Okay. 09:59AM VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.  The time is 10:00 a.m.  (Following a short recess at 10:00 a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 10:13 a.m.) 10:11AM  VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.  The time is 10:13 a.m.  MR. NANCE: Scott, before we go on, you and I had a discussion while we were off the Record about the fact that Rausser and Dicks marked their report confidential, and let me ask you to confirm that as far as we're going to be examining Dr. Coale today, you don't believe there's any confidentiality	Q Okay, but you're not  MR. McDANIEL: Can I just raise a point?  That is since that is both Dr. Dicks' and Dr.  Rausser's report, if so I don't want, when we say Dr. Dicks, to exclude Dr. Rausser's participation.  If you want to consider when you say Dr. Dicks, if you mean Dicks and Rausser as a team or if you want to break them up. I just don't what our Record to be a mess and suggest as far as that work product, that you can really separate them. All right?  Q Dr. Coale, did you ever talk to Dr. Rausser?  A Not that I know of.  Q Okay. Unless he was one of those people on a conference call or a WebEx that you can't name?  A Correct.  Q Did you ever have any E-mail correspondence with Dr. Rausser or snail mail correspondence for that matter?  A No.

5 m, 1 m m m m m m m	to ask you about.	Q And I guess we'll get into that a little	
A Okay.		later. Is that, in your mind, a valid first step to	
Q Okay, and what he and		do what they want to do?	
together, I guess, is beyond t	=	A Makes sense to me, yes.	
knowledge in the room right	now; right? 10:15AM	Q Step two, estimate the total pounds of 10	:17AM
A I guess it is.		phosphorus per acre required to raise STP to 65	
MR. McDANIEL: Yo	our side of the room.	based on historical forage yields, parenthesis,	
MR. NANCE: It migh	nt proceed more quickly	which remove some amounts of phosphorus, closed	
if we just swear you in and ge	•	parenthesis, and a baseline STP level reflective of	
MR. McDANIEL: Wo	e could have should have 10:15AM	IRW land with no history of poultry litter 10	:18AM
done that two years ago.		application. Does that seem to you to be a valid	
Q All right, and, Dr. Coal	e, I'll tell you I've	second step in a methodology?	
read this a couple of times, a	nd it's one of those	A Given that I'll say it again. If their	
things that I kind of understa	and, so please bear	method if their purpose is to make a general	
with me as we walk through	it. I'm just going to 10:15AM	economic analysis, they have to have these kind of	10:18AM
start at the beginning and ki		assumptions to make that kind of analysis, so, yes.	
towards the end, and the beg	=	Q Okay. Yeah, I'm not asking you to vouch for	
is a sentence that says, based		the economics. I'm asking you to vouch for the soil	
Census of Agriculture and da	<del>-</del>	science?	
outlined by plaintiff's consul	ltants, we developed an 10:16AM	A Okay.	
estimate of the current avera	age STP for all forage	Q Because that's your area; right?	
acres in the IRW. Do you kn	low what Census of	A Correct.	
Agriculture data that Dr. Die	cks and Dr. Rausser	Q Okay. Dr. Coale, do you know if Rausser and	
looked at?		Dicks assumed that there was no poultry application	
A Specifically, no.	10:16AM	in the watershed before 1974? 10:19	AM
	295	297	
Q Okay, and we may get t	to some particulars a	A I don't know if they made that assumption or	
little later on, but other than		not.	
this report, you don't know?	<del>-</del>	Q Okay. Do you know how they handled any land	
A Correct.		application before 1974?	
	what particular data and 10:16AM	A I don't recall how they did that. 10:194	λM
assumption outlined by plain	<del>-</del>	Q Okay. Step three, they say calculate the	1111
they looked at?		average STP rate by comparing the historical pounds	
A No, I don't.		of phosphorus per acre obtained in step one to the	
Q Okay. It says, the end i	result is an average	amount of phosphorus required to increase the STP to	
	=	65. Does that seem to you to be a reasonable step	10:19AN
of STP of 45.5 on all fertiliza			
of STP of 45.5 on all fertiliza acres in the IRW. Is that ST	P figure one that you	three in this method as a soil scientist?	
acres in the IRW. Is that ST	P figure one that you	three in this method as a soil scientist?  A Uh-huh.	
		A Uh-huh.	
acres in the IRW. Is that ST are opining is correct?	this will short	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.	
acres in the IRW. Is that STI are opining is correct? A No, sir. I don't know if	this will short there or not, but I	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.	10:19Al
acres in the IRW. Is that STI are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do	this will short the here or not, but I and methodology, and 10:17AM	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.	10:19A
acres in the IRW. Is that STI are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do just evaluated their approach	this will short the here or not, but I and methodology, and 10:17AM	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.  Q Now, the next sentence says, these procedures	10:19AN
acres in the IRW. Is that STI are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do just evaluated their approach the numbers they came up wi	this will short the here or not, but I and methodology, and th, I don't know where	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.  Q Now, the next sentence says, these procedures just outlined provide an estimate of an average STP	10:19AN
acres in the IRW. Is that ST are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do just evaluated their approach the numbers they came up withey got them from.	this will short there or not, but I and methodology, and ith, I don't know where the steps of the	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.  Q Now, the next sentence says, these procedures just outlined provide an estimate of an average STP for the watershed assuming some things.	10:19AN
acres in the IRW. Is that ST are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do just evaluated their approach the numbers they came up withey got them from.  Q Okay. Let's go through	this will short there or not, but I and methodology, and ith, I don't know where the steps of the	A Uh-huh. MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh. A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up. Q Now, the next sentence says, these procedures just outlined provide an estimate of an average STP for the watershed assuming some things. A Correct.	10:19AI
acres in the IRW. Is that ST are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do just evaluated their approach the numbers they came up withey got them from.  Q Okay. Let's go through methodology, which I guess a	this will short to here or not, but I and methodology, and 10:17AM ith, I don't know where the steps of the are the next things. 10:17AM	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.  Q Now, the next sentence says, these procedures just outlined provide an estimate of an average STP for the watershed assuming some things.  A Correct.  Q Let's talk about the assumptions. Uniform	10:19A
acres in the IRW. Is that STI are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do just evaluated their approach the numbers they came up withey got them from.  Q Okay. Let's go through methodology, which I guess a A Okay.	this will short to here or not, but I and methodology, and 10:17AM ith, I don't know where the steps of the are the next things. 10:17AM total amount of	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.  Q Now, the next sentence says, these procedures just outlined provide an estimate of an average STP for the watershed assuming some things.  A Correct.  Q Let's talk about the assumptions. Uniform distribution of litter? 10:20AM	10:19A
acres in the IRW. Is that STI are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do just evaluated their approach the numbers they came up withey got them from.  Q Okay. Let's go through methodology, which I guess a A Okay.  Q Step one is estimate the	this will short to here or not, but I and methodology, and 10:17AM tith, I don't know where the steps of the are the next things. 10:17AM total amount of altry litter in the IRW	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.  Q Now, the next sentence says, these procedures just outlined provide an estimate of an average STP for the watershed assuming some things.  A Correct.  Q Let's talk about the assumptions. Uniform distribution of litter?  10:20AM  A Yes, sir.	10:19AI
acres in the IRW. Is that STI are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do just evaluated their approach the numbers they came up withey got them from.  Q Okay. Let's go through methodology, which I guess a A Okay.  Q Step one is estimate the phosphorus produced by poor	this will short to here or not, but I and methodology, and 10:17AM tith, I don't know where the steps of the are the next things. 10:17AM total amount of altry litter in the IRW	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.  Q Now, the next sentence says, these procedures just outlined provide an estimate of an average STP for the watershed assuming some things.  A Correct.  Q Let's talk about the assumptions. Uniform distribution of litter?  10:20AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Is poultry litter uniformly distributed	10:19A
acres in the IRW. Is that STI are opining is correct?  A No, sir. I don't know if circuit what we're trying to do just evaluated their approach the numbers they came up withey got them from.  Q Okay. Let's go through methodology, which I guess a A Okay.  Q Step one is estimate the phosphorus produced by possince 1974, which they say the	this will short to here or not, but I and methodology, and 10:17AM tith, I don't know where the steps of the are the next things. 10:17AM total amount of altry litter in the IRW	A Uh-huh.  MR. McDANIEL: You said uh-huh.  A I said yes. Sorry. I'll try to speak up.  Q Now, the next sentence says, these procedures just outlined provide an estimate of an average STP for the watershed assuming some things.  A Correct.  Q Let's talk about the assumptions. Uniform distribution of litter?  10:20AM  A Yes, sir.  Q Is poultry litter uniformly distributed throughout the Illinois River watershed?	10:19A1

1	Q Why do you doubt that that's true?	would you agree that their assumptions are
2	A Because I would expect it to be utilized in a	uncharacteristic of the real world in the Illinois
3	very very variably across the watershed.	River watershed?
4	Q The second assumption is uniformity of soils.	A I believe they grossly over generalize what
5	Does that strike you, as a soil scientist, as a 10:20AM	the watershed probably looks like. 10:23AM
6	reasonable assumption about the Illinois River	Q They say that their purpose of the economic
7	watershed?	analysis is determining a median or weighted average
8	A No.	STP for the fertilizable forage-producing areas of
9	Q Okay. Why not?	the watershed. How did they provide a median or
10	A I wouldn't expect the soils to be uniform 10:21AM	weighted average STP? 10:24AM
11	across the watershed.	A I don't recall the process they went through.
12	Q Okay. Their next assumption is just says	I may not have even read the process they went
13		through.
	land types. Do you believe they're assuming that	
14	the land types of the watershed are uniform?	Q Okay. Maybe we'll find it out as we go along.
15	A I don't exactly know what the word land type 10:21AM	Then they say, we categorically assert that we have 10:24AM
16	means.	no actual data and believe that none currently
17	Q Okay, and that being the case, are their	exists to enable a true calculation of an accurate
18	assumption about land types reasonable?	value of the central tendency of STP in the
19	MR. McDANIEL: I want to be object to the	watershed.
20	form. Reasonable doesn't have a context. 10:21AM	A Okay. 10:24AM
21	Q In the context of soil science?	Q I guess you're not going to dispute that they
22	A From a very generic interpretation of what	don't have any actual data?
23	land type might mean, I interpret it to mean slope,	A No, I'm not.
24	flat land versus hilly land, versus steep sloped	Q So we'll assume they have no actual data, and
25	land. Those would be my presumption is that's 10:22AM	we'll assume that they believe that no such data 10:24AM
	299	301
1	what was meant by land type, which I expect to be	exists. Are you aware of the existence of any data
2	variable across the watershed.	that would enable the true calculation of an
3	Q Did you discuss slope and all that with Dr.	accurate value of central tendency of STP in the
4	Rausser and Dr. Dicks?	watershed?
5	A No. 10:22AM	A No, I'm not. 10:25AM
6	Q Okay. Livestock and agronomic practices. Did	Q Okay, and help me out. As a non-statistician,
7	you tell them anything about livestock and agronomic	what does central tendency of STP mean?
8	practices in the IRW?	A It means to calculate a statistic that
9	A No, I did not.	describes the average value, and that can be
10	Q Okay. Would you agree with them that their 10:22AM	weighted to land area or weighted to whatever factor 10:25AM
11	assumptions are certainly uncharacteristic of the	you want it to be weighted by. It means where's the
12	watershed?	average over the range you're looking at.
13	A My understanding was that and I've run	Q Next they say, lacking that true and accurate
14	across this over the years working with economists.	value, we have used the data available to derive a
15	They have to make very broad generalizations to make 10:23AM	mathematical approximation of this measure using the 10:25AM
16	everything uniform to apply economic decisions. So	following steps and assumptions?
17	when I'm in a discussion with an agricultural	A Uh-huh.
18	economist and they say we have to assume this, this,	Q Is it valid scientifically as a soil scientist
19	this and this, you dismiss it as a you have to	to proceed without a true and accurate value the way
20	make everything you have to make the world flat 10:23AM	they did? 10:26AM
21	before you can apply the numbers to it, and that's	A I would not.
22	the starting point. So I wasn't surprised that this	Q All right. The next the next major part of
23	is where the discussion started because I've seen it	the report is headed, step one, calculate total
24	before, but I realized it's not real world.	litter produced historically; right?
25	Q Okay, and as a real world soil scientist, 10:23AM	A Correct. 10:26AM
	300	302

1	Q They say, determining the amount of phosphorus	would have to be included.
2	produced in the IRW requires an estimate of the	Q Okay. Dr. Coale, do you know how Rausser and
3	historical tons of litter produced in the IRW. Do	Dicks accounted for poultry production in Arkansas
4	you have any agreement or disagreement with that	before 1997?
5	sentence? 10:26AM	A No. 10:29AM
6	A No. It makes sense.	Q Okay. Would you agree with the suggestion
7	Q Okay. The census and USDA's National	that they have been producing a lot of chickens in
8	Agricultural Statistics Service have data on the	Arkansas well before 1997, at least in the
9	number of chickens produced in Oklahoma, and then	watershed?
10	they say Adair, Cherokee, Delaware, annually from 10:26AM	A I believe the industry has been established 10:30AM
11	1974 to 1985. Beginning in 1992 it is available on	before 1997.
12	a five-year basis, 1992, 1997, 2002. Now, tell me	Q Okay. In the Arkansas part of the watershed?
13	what the USDA National Agricultural Statistics	A That's my general understanding, yes.
14	Service is.	Q Right. In addition, we have an estimate for
15	A It's a branch of the USDA that for every 10:27AM	the amount of litter produced in the most current 10:30AM
16	county in the country, they try to track	year. Plaintiff's consultant estimates this to be
17	agricultural products, whether it be corn or	354,000, revised from 347,000, and defendants'
18	chickens or cows or milk or what it might be, and	expert estimates this to be approximately 295,114
19	they tried to do surveys to determine how much is	tons or a net 225,114 for litter exportation
20	produced or generated in each county in the country. 10:27AM	beginning in 2004 is included. Do you have any 10:30AM
21	Q Speaking of chickens and turkeys, how do they	independent knowledge or opinion on the correctness
22	do those surveys?	of any of the numbers in that sentence?
23	A I don't know how they do the surveys.	A No. sir.
24	Q Are you here as a soil scientist or an	Q Have you looked at any of the expert reports
25	environmental scientist prepared to vouch for the 10:27AM	for either plaintiff or defendant from which those 10:30AM
	303	305
		300
1	accuracy of the USDA surveys?	numbers are taken?
2	A No.	A I don't know where they come from.
3	Q Okay. Data on the next sentence is, data	Q Next paragraph, once an estimate of poultry
4	on the number of birds in Arkansas counties, Benton	litter production for land application is developed,
5	and Washington, is available for 1997 and 2002 only. 10:28AM	the pounds of phosphorus is simply the tons of 10:31AM
6	Let me ask you, Dr. Coale, did you go to the books	litton multiplied by 60 given that them are
7	and pull out the census or online or wherever you go	litter multiplied by 60, given that there are
	and pull out the census of offine of wherever you go	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of
8	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics	. , ,
8 9	-	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of
	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.
9	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A? 10:28AM A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.
9 10	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A? 10:28AM	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM
9 10 11	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A? 10:28AM A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is,
9 10 11 12	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A?  10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of
9 10 11 12 13	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A? 10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is,
9 10 11 12 13	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A?  10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you
9 10 11 12 13 14	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A?  10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and that is Sequoyah County. Do you see anywhere in 10:28AM	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you really should understand how much what the 10:31AM
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A?  10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and that is Sequoyah County. Do you see anywhere in here where they have assembled bird numbers for	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you really should understand how much what the 10:31AM phosphorus content is of that lot of litter that you
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A?  10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and that is Sequoyah County. Do you see anywhere in here where they have assembled bird numbers for Sequoyah County or any part of it?	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you really should understand how much what the phosphorus content is of that lot of litter that you are managing. 60 is a typically used average number.  Q Okay.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A?  10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and that is Sequoyah County. Do you see anywhere in here where they have assembled bird numbers for Sequoyah County or any part of it?  A I don't see it mentioned.	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you really should understand how much — what the 10:31AM phosphorus content is of that lot of litter that you are managing. 60 is a typically used average number.  Q Okay.  A So if they're using that for an average 10:31AM
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A? 10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and that is Sequoyah County. Do you see anywhere in here where they have assembled bird numbers for Sequoyah County or any part of it?  A I don't see it mentioned.  Q Okay. If you were going to do this job and do	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you really should understand how much what the phosphorus content is of that lot of litter that you are managing. 60 is a typically used average number.  Q Okay.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A? 10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and that is Sequoyah County. Do you see anywhere in here where they have assembled bird numbers for Sequoyah County or any part of it?  A I don't see it mentioned.  Q Okay. If you were going to do this job and do it accurately, would you need to make some allowance 10:29AM	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you really should understand how much — what the 10:31AM phosphorus content is of that lot of litter that you are managing. 60 is a typically used average number.  Q Okay.  A So if they're using that for an average 10:31AM
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A? 10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and that is Sequoyah County. Do you see anywhere in here where they have assembled bird numbers for Sequoyah County or any part of it?  A I don't see it mentioned.  Q Okay. If you were going to do this job and do it accurately, would you need to make some allowance for whatever is going on in Sequoyah County that's	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you really should understand how much what the 10:31AM phosphorus content is of that lot of litter that you are managing. 60 is a typically used average number.  Q Okay.  A So if they're using that for an average 10:31AM approximation, it's a reasonable number.  Q Okay. Is it an average number that would apply to turkey litter as well as poultry litter?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A?  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and that is Sequoyah County. Do you see anywhere in here where they have assembled bird numbers for Sequoyah County or any part of it?  A I don't see it mentioned.  Q Okay. If you were going to do this job and do it accurately, would you need to make some allowance for whatever is going on in Sequoyah County that's pertinent?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I don't know if the poultry production in	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you really should understand how much — what the 10:31AM phosphorus content is of that lot of litter that you are managing. 60 is a typically used average number.  Q Okay.  A So if they're using that for an average 10:31AM approximation, it's a reasonable number.  Q Okay. Is it an average number that would apply to turkey litter as well as poultry litter?  A I can't say.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and pull out the Census of Agricultural Statistics and verify any of the numbers that Rausser and Dicks used to make Appendix A? 10:28AM  A No, sir. Like I said before, I didn't verify any of these numbers.  Q Okay. Now, there's another county that in Oklahoma that has part of it in the watershed, and that is Sequoyah County. Do you see anywhere in here where they have assembled bird numbers for Sequoyah County or any part of it?  A I don't see it mentioned.  Q Okay. If you were going to do this job and do it accurately, would you need to make some allowance for whatever is going on in Sequoyah County that's pertinent?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	approximately 60 pounds of phosphorus to one ton of litter. I think we're back in your area here.  A Yeah.  Q Is that a reasonable assumption that there are 10:31AM 60 pounds of phosphorus per ton of litter?  A Of course, there's going to be a lot of variability in how much phosphorus per ton there is, and if you are going to manage it specifically, you really should understand how much — what the phosphorus content is of that lot of litter that you are managing. 60 is a typically used average number.  Q Okay.  A So if they're using that for an average 10:31AM approximation, it's a reasonable number.  Q Okay. Is it an average number that would apply to turkey litter as well as poultry litter?

1	produced between 1974 and 2007 required several	Q Since the end point of the analysis appears to
2	extrapolations. These include, and they got, A, the	be trying to do an average of STP, how precise do
3	number of birds for years with missing data. I	you think you need to be?
4	guess if you only have data for certain years,	A I think you need to be to get an average
5	you've got to fill in the blanks, right; is that 10:32AM	STP value that is really truly physically 10:35AM
6	what they're saying?	representative, I think you need to be very precise.
7	A I believe so.	Q Okay. B, it says the next thing that they
8	Q Is that a scientifically valid way from your	have to extrapolate is the relationship between
9	point of view to do the job at hand?	poultry production in the three Oklahoma counties
10	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 10:32AM	and the two Arkansas counties. Now, putting aside 10:35AM
11	A If it was essential in their analysis to have	the fact that Sequoyah County is not represented,
12	a value for every year, I would probably look at the	let's
13	year before and the year after, and say it's	A Okay.
14	midpoint between those two points.	Q Why is it that you need to know the
15	Q Okay. Dr. Rausser and Dicks are retained 10:33AM	relationship between poultry production in the 10:35AM
16	experts for the defendants in this case, are they	Oklahoma counties versus the Arkansas counties?
17	not?	A I really don't know what that sentence means.
18	A I understand that to be correct.	Q That's at least two of us in the room. Okay.
19	Q Do you think the defendants in this case know	C at the top of Page 2 of Appendix A, the other
20	how many birds they've produced? 10:33AM	extrapolation they say they need to do is the 10:35AM
21	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	relationship between the number of birds in
22	A I have no idea.	inventory in the five-county area and the amount of
23	Q If you were wanting to know how many birds had	litter produced in the IRW. What does that sentence
24	been produced historically in the watershed by the	mean?
25	people who hired you, would you go to the people who 10:33AM 3 0 7	A Well, from my interpretation, they need to 10:36AM 3 0 9
1		harm the model and the determinant of the section of
1	hired you and ask them?	know they would need to determine the ratio of
2	A And I haven't been asked to do this, but I	number of birds to tons of litter.
3 4	would probably look for public records of production estimation, like the National Eco Statistics Service	Q Okay. All right. Then I guess we're going to
5	people, a place to start. If I wasn't satisfied 10:33AM	show the next three paragraphs appear to be those three extrapolations and how they did them. 10:36AM
6	with that data because it was incomplete, I would	three extrapolations and how they did them. 10:36AM  A Okay.
7	try to find direct data from the industry if I	Q A in bold print, it says estimating the number
8	could.	of birds for the years for which there is missing
9	Q Do you have any indication that they have gone	data, and they say in all cases where there was
10	to their own clients to try to find the data to fill 10:34AM	missing data for a particular year, e.g., between 10:36AM
11	in the blanks?	1987 and 1992, we used linear interpolation to
12	A I don't know where they got that data from.	create missing data points. Using this method, we
13	Q Okay. Just as an affirmative matter, do you	have annual data on the number of bird, chickens, in
14	have any indication they went to their own clients?	the three Oklahoma counties. Tell me what linear
15	A I have no indication. 10:34AM	interpolation is. 10:37AM
16	Q Okay. Would going to their own clients to get	A Just what I referred to before. If you have a
17	the numbers be a more reliable method than	missing year in this case, you would use the data
18	interpolating to fill in the blanks?	that you have, plot it out year versus whatever the
19	A I guess I'm hesitating because I don't know	measure is here is number of chickens, and draw a
20	what level of precision they needed for the purposes 10:34AM	linear relationship with a constant slope through 10:37AM
21	of their economic model. It may have been good	it, and then whatever the value of that linear
22	enough to interpolate. They may not have to worry	relationship for the year that's missing, you would
23	about it, or it may have been the case they needed	choose that to be your missing data point.
24	the best data they could get their hands on. I	Q Is it scientifically valid to create missing
25	don't know. 10:34AM	data that way? 10:37AM
	308	310

1	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	equation?
2	A It's been done and in some cases depends on	A That's my interpretation.
3	in some cases it's a fine estimation and in some	Q Okay. Okay. Now, they go on to say back to
4	cases it's a too gross of an estimation. Depends on	the main part of the text, of those, approximately
5	the goal and how it's going to be used. 10:38AM	8.8 million, or 17.88 percent, were located in 10:41AM
6	Q But to figure out an STP that mirrors the	Oklahoma counties. Do you know where they got that?
7	physical world, you'd need as much precision as you	A No, sir.
8	can get?	Q All right, and I'm assuming or am I correct in
9	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	assuming that up to this point under Subheading B,
10	A That's correct. 10:38AM	we're talking about 2002 because that's what the 10:41AM
11	Q Okay. So for the Oklahoma counties, it looks	previous sentence
12	like they have data, and check me if I'm wrong, they	A I would agree.
13	have data that goes back from the USDA from '74 to	Q Okay. The next sentence begins, in 1997 there
14	'85, and then are they linearly interpolating to	were approximately 48,760,637 birds in the
15	fill in the blanks from '87 to '92; is that what 10:38AM	five-county area, of which approximately 7.6 10:41AM
16	they're saying they've done for the Oklahoma	million, or 15.57 percent, were located in Oklahoma.
17	counties?	Do you know where any of those numbers came from?
18		A No, I don't.
19	7 1 .7	•
	Q Okay. Have you seen their work, I mean the	Q This means that between 1997 I'm reading
20	actual graphs or the computations or anything like 10:39AM	the next sentence and 2002, the share of the 10:42AM
21	that?	total birds in the five-county area in Arkansas
22	A No. This is the full extent of what I have	increased by approximately 2.31 percent or .46
23	seen.	percent annually. Can you explain to me what that
24	Q All right, sir. The next heading is B,	means?
25	estimating the total number of birds in the 10:39AM	A From their numbers, and I haven't done the 10:42AM
	311	313
1	five-county area. In 2002 there was a total	math, presumably they are looking at the rate of
1 2	invertory of 49,350,782 chickens in the five-county	math, presumably they are looking at the rate of increase in the population of birds in that area.
3	-	1 1
	area. Do you know where that number came from?	Q In the Arkansas part of the area?
4	A No, I don't. O Consequently, I assume you don't know whether 10:39AM	A In the Arkansas, yes, correct.
5 6	Q Consequently, I assume you don't know whether 10:39AM it's valid or not?	Q So is this one of those linear interpolations 10:42AM
7	A Correct.	where they're trying to account for the growth in
8	Q Then they have a parenthesis, a parenthetical	Arkansas between '97 and 2002?
		A It may be. I I don't really follow it real
9	that says there is 51,984,263 including turkeys, and	clearly.
10	it drops a footnote. Do you know where the 10:39AM fifty-one million nine hundred some odd including	Q In order to estimate the total number of birds 10:43AM
11 12	turkeys comes from?	in the five-county area for the missing years of
13		data, we assumed that this relationship held
	A No, sir.  Now their footnote says we have no	constant over the entire time period. Do you know
14	Q Now, their footnote says, we have no information on when the turkeys arrived or how many 10:40AM	what the entire time period is?
15	į į	A Offhand, I don't. 10:43AM
16 17	turkeys were there since the census data for the	Q Okay. Is this something you ever discussed
17	early years, 1974 to '85, is only available for the	with either Dr. Rausser or Dicks?
18	number of chickens. As such, we estimate the	A No, sir. Never at any of this level of
19	relationship between chicken production, broilers	detail.
20	and layers in the Oklahoma counties and the Arkansas 10:40AM	Q All right. If the time period began in 1974 10:43AM
21	counties and exclude turkeys. Do you know what that	because they say that's as far back as they have any
22	means?	data
23	A I would say they decided not to include	A Uh-huh.
24	turkeys.	Q are they I'm going to try to get this
25	Q So the turkeys just get written out of the 10:40AM	right taking the 1997, their 1997 estimate of 10:44AM
	312	314

1	Arkansas birds and reducing it .46 percent every	estimate of 354,000 tons of litter. So what does	
2	year backwards to 1974?	that mean?	
3	A That looks like a way it could be applied. I	A They had if you go back up in the second	
4	don't know if that's what they did or not. I have	sentence under C, they had two estimates above the	
5	no knowledge of that. 10:44AM	amount of tonnage of litter in their in the 10:48AM	
6	Q Okay. Would that be a valid way to create the	watershed. One is 354,000; the other was 221,114	
7	data to fill in the graph?	(sic). So I think the footnote refers to if they	
8	A It's a legitimate approach.	made the calculation using the 354,000 tons instead	
9	Q Is that the way you teach your students at	of the 225,114 tons.	
10	University of Maryland to do things? 10:44AM	Q All right. Let's stop a moment and let my 10:48AM	
11	A No, we don't teach it this way.	brain try to catch up0058 tons would be how much	
12	Q Okay. We used the current ratio of number of	in pounds approximately?	
13	birds produced in the IRW obtained from Billy Clay	A I'll need a calculator for that.	
14	to the inventory of birds from census in the	MR. NANCE: Do you have one of yours?	
15	five-county area as a constant factor in determining 10:45AM	MR. McDANIEL: Do you seriously think I 10:48AM	
16	the number of birds produced to annual inventory	brought a calculator in here?	
17	numbers throughout the time period. What does that	MR. NANCE: I brought a calculator with a	
18	sentence mean?	rubber band around it.	
19	A Apparently had obtained a ratio, number of	Q There you go.	
20	birds produced to the – from one source versus what 10:45AM	A Would you say the question again, please? 10:49AM	
21	the census said, being another source, and then they	Q What does 0.0058 tons work out to be in	
22	used that to create the use that ratio to fill in	pounds?	
23	the annual inventory numbers for when they didn't	A 11.6.	
24	have them.	Q Does 11.6 pounds of litter per bird sound	
25	Q Okay. Do you know what it was that Dr. Clay 10:45AM	reasonable to a man in your profession? 10:49AM	
	315	317	
1	gave them to do that?	A I rarely look at generation on a per-bird	
2	A No, I don't.	basis. I don't have a basis for answering that.	
3	Q All right. Subheading C, estimating the total	Q Would the answer be the same if we looked at	
4	amount of litter produced. We have several	the figure in Footnote 2 of 0.0069 tons per bird?	
5	estimates of the annual amount of litter available 10:46AM	A Whether I thought the outcome is reasonable? 10:50AM	
6	for land application in the IRW in recent years.	Q Yeah.	
7	These estimates include 354,000 tons from	A Yeah, same answer.	
8	plaintiff's consultant, Dr. Fisher, and 225,114 tons	Q Okay. Their next sentence in the text under	
9	from defendants' consultant, Dr. Clay. The	Subparagraph C, assuming that 225,114 tons of litter	
10	relationship between the litter produced and the 10:46AM	are land applied after the exportation program 10:50AM	
11	census inventory of birds is approximately 0.0058 in	became effective in 2004 and 295,114 was land	
12	2007, given an estimated land applied litter of	applied in the prior year, the total tons of litter	
13	295,114 tons, and they drop another footnote. Do	produced between 1974 and 2007 is approximately	
14	you know how they did that?	8,017,422, I assume tons but they don't say it.	
15	A No, I don't. 10:46AM	Have you done the math on that? 10:51AM	
16	Q Okay. Do you know what the 0.0058 number	A No, I have not.	
17	represents?	Q Do you understand how they did the math on it?	
18	A From this sentence, I interpret that to be	A No. I'd have to study it in much detail to	
19	litter produced per bird.	figure out what they did.	
20	Q Okay. In what units; can you tell? 10:47AM	Q Dr. Coale, I admit I was listening to my 10:51AM	
21	A I can't tell for sure, but the only units in	counsel or my colleague and not to you, so will you	
22	that sentence is in tons.	repeat your answer?	
23	Q Okay. Let's take the footnote down to	A The answer is, no, I don't know how they did	
24	Footnote No. 2 down to the bottom. That footnote	it.	
25	reads, the litter to bird ratio is 0.0069, using an 10:47AM	Q Do you know what the import program is in the 10:51AM	
	316	318	

1	Illinois River watershed, or excuse me, export	poultry litter is the only source of phosphorus in
2	program?	the Illinois River watershed?
3	A No, I don't.	A In the real world, probably not, but perhaps
4	Q Do you know if any litter is imported into the	it's good enough for their purposes.
5	Illinois River watershed? 10:52AM	Q Over on the top of Page 3, hay output from 10:56AM
6	A I don't know that.	1974 to 2007 was determined using methods similar to
7	Q Okay. Their next sentence is, if we assume	those for estimating litter production. Hay output
8	that 354,000 tons of litter is land applied, the	data was collected for Adair, Cherokee and Delaware
9	total amount of litter is 9,659,093 tons for the	Counties for 1974 through 2007 and Benton and
10	same time period, and then it drops a Footnote 3. 10:52AM	Washington Counties for 1997 through 2002. Do you 10:57AM
11	Once again, and I realize that's using the	know where they collected that data?
12	plaintiff's expert number, but do you know how they	A No. My assumption would be from the National
13	used that number to come up with a calculation that	Agricultural Statistics Service, but it doesn't say.
14	gets you 9.6 million tons?	Q But it doesn't say that, okay. Using this
15	A I've not checked that calculation. I don't 10:52AM	data, we estimate that hay that total hay 10:57AM
16	know how they did it.	production for the period time period was roughly
17	Q All right, and, consequently, you're not in a	11.8 million tons. Do you have any firsthand
18	position to vouch for it, are you?	knowledge of how they did that calculation?
19	A No, I'm not.	A Other than the opening sentence saying they
20	Q Okay. The Footnote 3 says, if we assume that 10:52AM	used methods similar to what they did for the litter 10:57AM
21	poultry litter production has been 354,000 tons	production estimates.
22	since 2002 and has remained constant, then the total	Q So they created the data points between where
23	litter produced would be 10,139,750 tons and,	they had data and where they didn't have data?
24	semicolon, for annual production of 295,114, there	A I would assume that's what it means.
25	would be a total of 8,453,057 tons. Do you know why 10:53AM 319	Q Okay, but do you know with more certainty than 10:58AM 3 2 1
1 2	they're assuming constant production since 2002?  A No, I don't.	an assumption? A No.
3	Q Okay, and consequently well, never mind.	Q Okay. Given this level of hay production,
4	The next step in their analysis, step two, estimate	81,086 tons of phosphorus is required over that
5	the total pounds of phosphorus per acre required to 10:54AM	period. Is that a reasonable estimate of the amount 10:58AM
6	raise STP to 65. Our general assumption is there's	of phosphorus needed to produce 11.8 million tons of
7	one source supplying phosphorus on an annual basis,	something, hay?
8	poultry litter, and two factors that demand	A Again, I haven't checked the math.
9	phosphorus, soil to get the STP up to 65 and reach	Q Okay. Because the common practice in the IRW
10	100 percent yield, and actual forage, pasture and 10:54AM	is to remove hay from the fields of production to 10:58AM
11	hay produced. Are they assuming or accounting for	storage areas in close proximity to winter feeding
12	any other source of phosphorus in the watershed	lots or to move it directly from the fields to the
13	besides poultry litter?	lots at the time of feeding, we assumed that all the
14	A No. They state right out that they're only	phosphorus is removed from the hay fields and
15	considering litter. 10:55AM	transported to the, quote, all other areas (sic), 10:58AM
16	Q Do you know for each ton of forage	closed quote.
17	produced, 13.7 pounds of phosphorus are removed. Is	A Acres, all other acres.
18	that a realistic figure?	Q Acres, excuse me. They don't cite a source
19 20	A Hang on one second. I'll do a little math.  It's reasonable, yeah. 10:56AM	for that assumption. Do you know why they assumed
21		that it's a common practice in the Illinois River 10:59AM watershed to do that?
22	Q Explain to me the calculation you just did.  A Oh, I just did it on a percentage basis of a	A I presume their knowledge of the watershed led
22 23	Percent of a ton, if 1 percent of a ton of forage is	them to believe it was the common practice.
	13.7 pounds.	Q Where does Dr. Rausser live?
24		
24 25	Q Dr. Coale, is it a reasonable assumption that 10:56AM	A I have no idea. 10:59AM

1	Q Do you think he lives in Oklahoma?	made any empirical observations that support such a
2	A I I don't know.	proposition?
3	Q Okay. Do you have any basis for thinking	A I don't know.
4	either one of these two economists knows the	Q Do you know where Dr. Clay came up with that
5	agricultural practices in this watershed? 10:59AM	40 percent figure? 11:02AM
6	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	A I do not know.
7	A No, but I believe earlier on they said they	Q Then are you in a position to validate it as
8	were in consultation with Billy Clay, who seems to	in any way scientifically correct?
9	have personal knowledge of what is going on in the	A I don't know where it came from, no, sir.
10	watershed. 10:59AM	Q Would a stream through a field be a means of 11:02AM
11	Q Okay. Do you know if Dr. Clay has done any	active transport for phosphorus?
12	scientifically valid study of the use of hay in the	A Yes.
13	Illinois River watershed?	
14		Q Would it be a means of active transport for phosphorus in poultry litter if litter were applied
±¶ 15	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I don't know that. 11:00AM	
		near that stream? 11:02AM
16	Q Okay. Would anecdotal information from Dr.	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
17	Clay or anyone else be a valid basis for an	A If litter was in the stream?
18	assumption like this?	Q Applied near the stream.
19	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	A And it was transported from where it was
20	A I don't know. 11:00AM	applied to the stream, then the stream would act as 11:03AM
21	Q You're certainly not in a position, are you,	a transport pathway.
22	to endorse an anecdotal report from Dr. Clay or	Q Okay. The next sentence, another source of
23	anybody else to	phosphorus is comes from fields where forage has
24	A No, sir.	been, parenthesis, fescue, closed parenthesis,
25	Q Okay. Pasture forage output was estimated 11:00AM	stockpiled, parenthesis, growth saved for later use, 11:03AM
	323	325
	using the groupes have sields for the moried and the	
1	using the average hay yields for the period and the	closed parenthesis, or overseeded and limit grazed.
2	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What	Do you know what that means?
<u>2</u> 3	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not
2 3 4	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.
2 3 4 5	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM
2 3 4 5	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot
2 3 4 5 6 7	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it
2 3 4 5 6 7	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense.  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense.  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they  11:03AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field.	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense.  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they make certain assertions about what goes on in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense.  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense.  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense.  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense.  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they 11:03AM make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage stays in the animal.	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they 11:03AM make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice, but I don't know where they got that information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage stays in the animal.  Q Okay. Is that a reasonable number?	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they 11:03AM make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice, but I don't know where they got that information from.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage stays in the animal.  Q Okay. Is that a reasonable number?  A It's reasonable.	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they 11:03AM make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice, but I don't know where they got that information from.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, does storage of forage in an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage stays in the animal.  Q Okay. Is that a reasonable number?  A It's reasonable.  Q Okay. However, according to Clay, 11:01AM	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they 11:03AM make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice, but I don't know where they got that information from.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, does storage of forage in an area increase the STP in that area, of the soil in 11:04AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage stays in the animal.  Q Okay. Is that a reasonable number?  A It's reasonable.  Q Okay. However, according to Clay, 11:01AM approximately 40 percent of the phosphorus is	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they 11:03AM make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice, but I don't know where they got that information from.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, does storage of forage in an area increase the STP in that area, of the soil in 11:04AM that area?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage stays in the animal.  Q Okay. Is that a reasonable number?  A It's reasonable.  Q Okay. However, according to Clay, 11:01AM approximately 40 percent of the phosphorus is transported by cattle through their defecation in	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense.  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they 11:03AM make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice, but I don't know where they got that information from.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, does storage of forage in an area increase the STP in that area, of the soil in 11:04AM that area?  A Stockpiled storage?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage stays in the animal.  Q Okay. Is that a reasonable number?  A It's reasonable.  Q Okay. However, according to Clay, 11:01AM approximately 40 percent of the phosphorus is transported by cattle through their defecation in wooded and riparian areas, including the streams and	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they 11:03AM make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice, but I don't know where they got that information from.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, does storage of forage in an area increase the STP in that area, of the soil in 11:04AM that area?  A Stockpiled storage?  Q Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage stays in the animal. Q Okay. Is that a reasonable number? A It's reasonable. Q Okay. However, according to Clay, 11:01AM approximately 40 percent of the phosphorus is transported by cattle through their defecation in wooded and riparian areas, including the streams and other water-holding bodies. Are you aware of	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense.  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do.  11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice, but I don't know where they got that information from.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, does storage of forage in an area increase the STP in that area, of the soil in that area?  A Stockpiled storage?  Q Right.  A No, sir, I wouldn't expect it to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	total fertilizable pasture acres for the area. What does that mean?  A That means that total interpreting that sentence says that total forage production was 11:00AM estimated using the average hay yields on, I would presume, a per-acre basis and over the total acreage available. So you get average yield per acre.  Q However, because the pasture forage is removed directly by cattle in the fields, only a portion of 11:01AM the phosphorus is actually removed from the field. Roughly 10 percent of the phosphorus is removed in the development of beef cattle. Does that mean 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage; is that how you interpret that? 11:01AM  A They said there approximately 10 percent of the phosphorus in the forage stays in the animal.  Q Okay. Is that a reasonable number?  A It's reasonable.  Q Okay. However, according to Clay, 11:01AM approximately 40 percent of the phosphorus is transported by cattle through their defecation in wooded and riparian areas, including the streams and	Do you know what that means?  A I have a general sense what it means but not precisely.  Q Give me your best general sense. 11:03AM  A Well, stockpiled refers to when you grow a lot of forage on a field and then you don't harvest it for hay and don't let the cow graze it; you leave it there for utilization at a later time.  Q All right. There's a Footnote 4 where they 11:03AM make certain assertions about what goes on in the watershed. Do you know the basis for the assertions in Footnote 4?  A I have to read Footnote 4.  Q Please do. 11:04AM  A They describe what is meant by that practice, but I don't know where they got that information from.  Q Okay. Dr. Coale, does storage of forage in an area increase the STP in that area, of the soil in 11:04AM that area?  A Stockpiled storage?  Q Right.

1	the STP?	prior to any poultry litter STP was approximately
2	A I wouldn't expect it to.	20, and there's a footnote. Does an STP of 20
3	Q Okay. Next sentence, this practice allows	strike you as a reasonable average for the Illinois
4	cattle to graze in the forage areas during short	River watershed before any fertilizer was applied?
5	periods and then return to winter feed areas. Next 11:05AM	A Well, first I would need to know units, 11:08AM
6	sentence, thus, while only 10 percent of the	whether they are talking pounds per acre or parts
7	phosphorus actually leaves the watershed through the	per million.
8	sale of cattle, more phosphorus is transported off	Q That's an important thing to know.
9	the fertilizable fields onto wooded, riparian,	A Yeah.
10	winter feeding and other acres during the normal 11:05AM	Q Although they appear to be talking pounds per 11:08AM
11	cattle grazing and management. Is the correctness	acre throughout.
12	of that statement dependent upon the assumptions	A From the footnote that is on that sentence,
13	that go into it?	the Footnote 8, that footnote has it in milligrams
14	A Yes.	per kilogram.
15	Q Okay, and we estimate that, based on the 11:05AM	Q So it's confusing, is it not? 11:08AM
16	assumptions, the total amount of phosphorus removed	A Yes.
17	from the fertilizable pasturelands over the period	Q Okay. If it was 20 pounds per acre, would you
18	at 129,633 tons. Do you know how they arrived at	consider it a reasonable average for the whole
19	that number?	watershed before any fertilizer was applied?
20	MR. McDANIEL: Just for the Record, you 11:06AM	A I don't think I can really speculate that. 11:09AM
21	misread the tonnage at the end.	Q Same question. If it were in milligrams per
22	Q I'm sorry. The correct number, if I misspoke,	kilogram or 20 milligrams per kilogram, would it be
23	was 129,663 tons.	a reasonable estimate of the STP of the whole
24	A No, I don't.	watershed before any fertilizer was applied?
25	Q Next paragraph, Oklahoma State University uses 11:06AM	A I have no way of answering that either. 11:09AM
	327	329
1	an STP of 65 as the level of phosphorus in pounds	Q Top of Page 4, thus, STP would need to be
2	per acre that is required for 100 percent yield	raised approximately 45 units, 65 minus 20, to
3	sufficiency, while an STP of 120 ensures that all	achieve the minimum requirement for 100 percent
4	areas of the field reach the average STP of 65. I	field efficiency. Well, that may answer the
5	think we understand that. 11:06AM	11.00 A M
6		question. 11:09AM
	To obtain a reasonable estimate of STPs prior	A That may answer the question. It gives the
7	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.
7 8		A That may answer the question. It gives the
8 9	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all
8 9 10	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it 11:09AM
8 9 10 11	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it 11:09AM says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are
8 9 10 11	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it 11:09AM says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a
8 9 10 11 12	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?
8 9 10 11 12 13	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of 11:07AM	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr.  Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of 11:07AM Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?  A No, I don't.	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.  Q So for that purposes, it would be a reasonable
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of 11:07AM Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?  A No, I don't.  Q Okay. Dr. Olsen appears to have taken samples	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.  Q So for that purposes, it would be a reasonable number?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?  A No, I don't.  Q Okay. Dr. Olsen appears to have taken samples of three fields that had not received commercial	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.  Q So for that purposes, it would be a reasonable number?  A Probably, yeah.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of 11:07AM Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?  A No, I don't.  Q Okay. Dr. Olsen appears to have taken samples of three fields that had not received commercial litter fertilizer commercial fertilizer 11:07AM	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.  Q So for that purposes, it would be a reasonable number?  A Probably, yeah.  Q Okay. For the 491,276 acres of fertilizable 11:10AM
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of 11:07AM Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?  A No, I don't.  Q Okay. Dr. Olsen appears to have taken samples of three fields that had not received commercial litter fertilizer commercial fertilizer 11:07AM applications over seven years and never received	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.  Q So for that purposes, it would be a reasonable number?  A Probably, yeah. Q Okay. For the 491,276 acres of fertilizable 11:10AM forage production in the IRW, this would amount to
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of 11:07AM Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?  A No, I don't.  Q Okay. Dr. Olsen appears to have taken samples of three fields that had not received commercial litter fertilizer commercial fertilizer 11:07AM applications over seven years and never received poultry litter; however, one sampled field may have	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.  Q So for that purposes, it would be a reasonable number?  A Probably, yeah.  Q Okay. For the 491,276 acres of fertilizable forage production in the IRW, this would amount to 132,645 tons of phosphorus fertilizer required to
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of 11:07AM Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?  A No, I don't.  Q Okay. Dr. Olsen appears to have taken samples of three fields that had not received commercial litter fertilizer commercial fertilizer 11:07AM applications over seven years and never received poultry litter; however, one sampled field may have received a poultry litter application of 10 to 15	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.  Q So for that purposes, it would be a reasonable number?  A Probably, yeah.  Q Okay. For the 491,276 acres of fertilizable 11:10AM forage production in the IRW, this would amount to 132,645 tons of phosphorus fertilizer required to raise STP from 20 to 65. First, do you know where
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of 11:07AM Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?  A No, I don't.  Q Okay. Dr. Olsen appears to have taken samples of three fields that had not received commercial litter fertilizer commercial fertilizer 11:07AM applications over seven years and never received poultry litter; however, one sampled field may have received a poultry litter application of 10 to 15 years ago. Drops a footnote. Based on Olsen's	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.  Q So for that purposes, it would be a reasonable number?  A Probably, yeah.  Q Okay. For the 491,276 acres of fertilizable forage production in the IRW, this would amount to 132,645 tons of phosphorus fertilizer required to raise STP from 20 to 65. First, do you know where they came up with the 491,000 acres number?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to any poultry litter application, we relied on soil samples taken by plaintiff consultant, Dr. Olsen.  Drops a Footnote 6. Although we're aware that the court has deemed Dr. Olsen's analysis not 11:06AM sufficiently reliable, we required a baseline estimate of STP in the IRW, and these were the only such samples available for us at the time of filing this report. Do you personally know what the court has said one way or another about the reliability of 11:07AM Dr. Olsen's baseline STP?  A No, I don't.  Q Okay. Dr. Olsen appears to have taken samples of three fields that had not received commercial litter fertilizer commercial fertilizer 11:07AM applications over seven years and never received poultry litter; however, one sampled field may have received a poultry litter application of 10 to 15	A That may answer the question. It gives the context.  Q All right. A conservative estimate, given OSU's determination that STP of 120 to ensure all points in the field have an STP of 65. Then it says, approximately 12 pounds of phosphorus are required to raise STP by one unit. Is that a reasonable estimate?  A That's the number that I think Dr. Johnson's report said between 10 to 15. So that's 11:10AM the midpoint of that range.  Q So for that purposes, it would be a reasonable number?  A Probably, yeah.  Q Okay. For the 491,276 acres of fertilizable 11:10AM forage production in the IRW, this would amount to 132,645 tons of phosphorus fertilizer required to raise STP from 20 to 65. First, do you know where

1	Q I think we've seen that same number before.		Q Step three, calculate the STP rate. In steps	
2	A I think I recognize the number, but I didn't		one and two, we established the total tons of litter	
3	know how they generated it then, so I don't know		produced from 1974 to 2007 and the total tons of	
4	now.		litter required to increase STP to 65 on a per-acre	
5	Q Okay. Have you done the calculation that they	11:10AM	basis. There have been approximately 8 million tons	11:21AM
6	say you would need 132,645 tons to raise it from 20		of litter produced for land application since 1974	
7	to 65?		and 16.9 million tons of litter produced based on	
8	A No, I have not.		491,276 forage acres in the IRW.	
9	Q Okay. So you're not at this point prepared to		MR. McDANIEL: Bob, I think you misread	
10	vouch for it? 11:11AM		that. 11:21AM	
11	A No. I haven't done the math.		MR. NANCE: I may have.	
12	Q Okay.		MR. McDANIEL: Starting with 16.9. I think	
13	MR. NANCE: Let's change tapes and try to		you inserted the word million.	
14	keep moving ahead.		Q 16.9 tons of litter per acre based on 491,276	
15	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now off the Record.	11:11AM	forage acres. 11:21AM	
16	The time is 11:12 a.m.		MR. McDANIEL: Not an insubstantial issue.	
17	(Following a short recess at 11:12		MR. NANCE: It's six powers of ten.	
18	a.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 11:20		Q Can you vouch for those computations?	
19	a.m.)		A No, I can't.	
20	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.	11:18AM	Q In step two above, we established that 23 tons	11:21AM
21	The time is 11:20 a.m.		of litter per acre are required to reach an STP of	
22	Q Dr. Coale, the next paragraph on Page 4 of		65 on each acre, 34 tons to ensure STP of 65	
23	Appendix A says, thus, the total phosphorus required		uniformly across all acres. Since there is only an	
24	to produce all forage and obtain an STP of 65 is		average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre,	
25	estimated to be 343,394 tons over the period 1974 to	11:19AM	only 70 percent of the litter required to reach an	11:22AM
	331		333	
1	2008. That's do you know how they arrived at		STP of 65 has been land applied. 48 percent to	
2	that number?		ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does	s
<u>2</u> 3	that number? A No, I don't.		ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?	S
2 3 4	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP	44 40.54	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.	
2 3 4 5	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level	11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.	s 11:22AM
2 3 4 5 6	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the	11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.	
2 3 4 5 6 7	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how	11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?	11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to		ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to	11:22AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional	<b>11:19AM</b> 11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.		ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the	11:22AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from		ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.	11:22AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?		ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you	11:22AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.	11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would		ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay. 11:23AM	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me,	11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay. 11:23AM  Q — and apply all the litter, I guess, that's	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me, 11,446,443 tons and 16,850,499 tons of litter. Do	11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay.  11:23AM  Q — and apply all the litter, I guess, that's ever been produced in the watershed, then you're	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me, 11,446,443 tons and 16,850,499 tons of litter. Do you know how they arrived at either one of those	11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay. 11:23AM  Q — and apply all the litter, I guess, that's ever been produced in the watershed, then you're only 70 percent of the distance from 20 to 65; is	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me, 11,446,443 tons and 16,850,499 tons of litter. Do you know how they arrived at either one of those numbers?	11:19AM 11:20AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay. 11:23AM  Q — and apply all the litter, I guess, that's ever been produced in the watershed, then you're only 70 percent of the distance from 20 to 65; is that what that means?	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me, 11,446,443 tons and 16,850,499 tons of litter. Do you know how they arrived at either one of those numbers?  A No, I don't know the math behind how they got	11:19AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay.  11:23AM  Q — and apply all the litter, I guess, that's ever been produced in the watershed, then you're only 70 percent of the distance from 20 to 65; is that what that means?  A Yes.  11:23AM	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me, 11,446,443 tons and 16,850,499 tons of litter. Do you know how they arrived at either one of those numbers?  A No, I don't know the math behind how they got those numbers.	11:19AM 11:20AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay.  11:23AM  Q — and apply all the litter, I guess, that's ever been produced in the watershed, then you're only 70 percent of the distance from 20 to 65; is that what that means?  A Yes.  11:23AM  Q Okay, and I guess you're only 48 percent of	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me, 11,446,443 tons and 16,850,499 tons of litter. Do you know how they arrived at either one of those numbers?  A No, I don't know the math behind how they got those numbers.  Q Okay. Or 23 tons and 34 tons per fertilizable	11:19AM 11:20AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline  A Okay. 11:23AM  Q and apply all the litter, I guess, that's ever been produced in the watershed, then you're only 70 percent of the distance from 20 to 65; is that what that means?  A Yes. 11:23AM  Q Okay, and I guess you're only 48 percent of the way from 20 to 120. Is that what the	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me, 11,446,443 tons and 16,850,499 tons of litter. Do you know how they arrived at either one of those numbers?  A No, I don't know the math behind how they got those numbers.  Q Okay. Or 23 tons and 34 tons per fertilizable forage acre respectively. Do you know how they	11:19AM 11:20AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay. 11:23AM  Q — and apply all the litter, I guess, that's ever been produced in the watershed, then you're only 70 percent of the distance from 20 to 65; is that what that means?  A Yes. 11:23AM  Q Okay, and I guess you're only 48 percent of the way from 20 to 120. Is that what the parenthetical means?	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me, 11,446,443 tons and 16,850,499 tons of litter. Do you know how they arrived at either one of those numbers?  A No, I don't know the math behind how they got those numbers.  Q Okay. Or 23 tons and 34 tons per fertilizable forage acre respectively. Do you know how they arrived at either one of those numbers?	11:19AM 11:20AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay. 11:23AM  Q — and apply all the litter, I guess, that's ever been produced in the watershed, then you're only 70 percent of the distance from 20 to 65; is that what that means?  A Yes. 11:23AM  Q Okay, and I guess you're only 48 percent of the way from 20 to 120. Is that what the parenthetical means?  A I understand that to mean that, yes.	11:22AM 11:23AM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that number?  A No, I don't.  Q Next sentence, to reach the level of STP required to ensure the entire field has an STP level that provides 100 percent yield efficiency, the total tons would be 505,515 tons. Do you know how they arrived at that figure?  A I presume that's the assume the STP has to be 120 over the entire field. So the additional amount needed to raise it from 65 to 120.  Q So that would basically be 100 points from their baseline of 20?  A Basically, yes.  Q Okay. To ensure an STP of 65 and 120 would require 11,446,443 tons and 16 excuse me, 11,446,443 tons and 16,850,499 tons of litter. Do you know how they arrived at either one of those numbers?  A No, I don't know the math behind how they got those numbers.  Q Okay. Or 23 tons and 34 tons per fertilizable forage acre respectively. Do you know how they	11:19AM 11:20AM	ensure an STP uniformly across all acres. What does that sentence mean, sir?  MR. McDANIEL: You left the word 65 out.  MR. NANCE: If I did, I apologize.  MR. McDANIEL: Okay.  A Well, reading the sentence, it says that there's an average of 16.9 tons of poultry litter per acre, and 70 percent of the litter required to reach the STP of 65 had been land applied. So that only 75 — so that only represents 70 percent of the litter that was required to raise STP to 65.  Q Okay, and only — so that means that if you are assuming 20 as your baseline —  A Okay. 11:23AM  Q — and apply all the litter, I guess, that's ever been produced in the watershed, then you're only 70 percent of the distance from 20 to 65; is that what that means?  A Yes. 11:23AM  Q Okay, and I guess you're only 48 percent of the way from 20 to 120. Is that what the parenthetical means?	11:22AM 11:23AM

I	
demands and supply, the average STP is estimated to	evaluation, it would be much more rigorous and
be 45.5 pounds per acre. Is that a scientifically	require much more data than what they've used in
valid average that you are willing to back as a soil	this economic comparison.
4 scientist?	Q Nevertheless, in Paragraph 10C of your report,
MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:24AM	Dr. Coale, you say, I agree with the methodology 11:27AM
A No. As a soil scientist, I would want a lot	used as outlined in Appendix A to estimate poultry
7 more rigorous data to go into it.	litter generation, forage nutrient P utilization,
Q Again, this estimation is based on the	baseline soil test P average values, soil test P
assumption that all the litter produced has been	response to poultry litter application to
uniformly applied throughout the IRW fertilizable 11:24AM	pastureland and poultry litter available for P-based 11:27AM
forage-producing acres, that litter has been the	land application in the IRW. Is there anything
only additive source of phosphorus in the watershed,	about that agreement you would like to modify now?
and that the data used is reflective of practices	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
and enterprises in the IRW. Are those assumptions	A Well, it's not modified. Well, just as I said
5 true? 11:25AM	in the beginning, understand where what the 11:27AM
A I don't know if necessarily true is the right	purpose was. The purpose was these individuals came
word. I think they may be adequate for the purposes	to me and said we're doing an economic analysis of
of their economic evaluation they're trying to make.	ag production systems in the IRW. We need to make
For the purposes of this evaluation, it may be fine,	certain assumptions and generalities, and for the
but I don't know if you can call them true or not 11:25AM	purposes of that economic analysis, their 11:28AM
true.	methodology is fine. I've seen worse. I certainly
Q Is it true that all of the litter produced in	wouldn't say that's the methodology I would use for
the Illinois River watershed has been uniformly	a rigorous scientific evaluation. I think there's a
applied over the acres of pasture in the watershed?	big difference in how you approach it. So I'm
A My understanding, I wouldn't expect that to be 11:25AM	saying from what their goal was, that's a fine way 11:28AM
335	337
true.	to take an estimate at it for their purposes.
	Q But you were the scientific advisor on the
Q In fact, that would be a shocking suggestion in your business, would it not?	soil science part of this exercise; right?
in your business, would it not?  A It would be. It would be a surprise.	A For the purposes I just outlined, yes.
Q Would it be a surprise in your profession as 11:25AM	Q What do you understand their purposes to have 11:28AM
well to suggest that phosphorus litter has been the	been in this exercise?
only additive source of phosphorus in the watershed?	A They wanted to be able to take this
A That would be a surprise.	information and then apply economic assessments,
Q And would it be fair to say that you're just	dollars cash in, cash out I never saw that
not in a position to opine on the agricultural 11:26AM	part so I don't know what they're doing; that's my  11:29AM
practices and enterprises in the IRW?	assumption to get a value on the litter that was
A That's correct.	in the watershed available, what it would do to the
Q Okay. This estimation should not be used to	soil test P. It was applied on very general terms,
Q Okay. This estimation should not be used to	son test 1. It was applied on very general terms,
	hay production, forage production, animal
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted	hay production, forage production, animal
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple 11:26AM	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple 11:26AM tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What does that sentence mean?	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.  Q And for that, they used a very general
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What does that sentence mean?  A I think it is basically saying that they don't	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.  Q And for that, they used a very general agronomic average of things that we've gone through
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What does that sentence mean?  A I think it is basically saying that they don't have a lot of confidence that their estimate is	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.  Q And for that, they used a very general agronomic average of things that we've gone through here?
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple 11:26AM tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What does that sentence mean?  A I think it is basically saying that they don't have a lot of confidence that their estimate is actually representative of the physical soil 11:26AM	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.  Q And for that, they used a very general agronomic average of things that we've gone through here?  A Yes. 11:29AM
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What does that sentence mean?  A I think it is basically saying that they don't have a lot of confidence that their estimate is actually representative of the physical soil 11:26AM properties.	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.  Q And for that, they used a very general agronomic average of things that we've gone through here?  A Yes. 11:29AM  Q And that's valid?
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What does that sentence mean?  A I think it is basically saying that they don't have a lot of confidence that their estimate is actually representative of the physical soil properties.  Q Do you have any confidence that their estimate	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.  Q And for that, they used a very general agronomic average of things that we've gone through here?  A Yes. 11:29AM  Q And that's valid?  A I've seen it done at that level for economic
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What does that sentence mean? A I think it is basically saying that they don't have a lot of confidence that their estimate is actually representative of the physical soil 11:26AM properties. Q Do you have any confidence that their estimate is actually representative of the physical soil	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.  Q And for that, they used a very general agronomic average of things that we've gone through here?  A Yes. 11:29AM  Q And that's valid?  A I've seen it done at that level for economic analysis before, and usually when you read an
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple 11:26AM tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What does that sentence mean?  A I think it is basically saying that they don't have a lot of confidence that their estimate is actually representative of the physical soil 11:26AM properties.  Q Do you have any confidence that their estimate is actually representative of the physical soil property.	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.  Q And for that, they used a very general agronomic average of things that we've gone through here?  A Yes. 11:29AM  Q And that's valid?  A I've seen it done at that level for economic analysis before, and usually when you read an economic analysis like that, they lay out right
indicate that we have calculated an actual weighted average, median or any other measure of simple tendency of the current STP in the watershed. What does that sentence mean? A I think it is basically saying that they don't have a lot of confidence that their estimate is actually representative of the physical soil properties.  Q Do you have any confidence that their estimate is actually representative of the physical soil	production. It was a very general economic 11:29AM analysis.  Q And for that, they used a very general agronomic average of things that we've gone through here?  A Yes. 11:29AM  Q And that's valid?  A I've seen it done at that level for economic analysis before, and usually when you read an

1	the physical scientists look at those assumptions	A I don't think you can make the same
2	and say that's a ridiculous assumption, that's a	assumptions in a valid scientific assessment, no,
3	fair assumption, they weigh each one, and these are	sir. You have to be much more precise and much more
4	the assumptions they made. If they wanted to do the	rigor.
5	calculations, I understood where they were going and 11:29AM	Q Is there any understanding in your field, Dr. 11:32AM
6	I thought their methodology was okay.	Coale, about how far on average litter is
7	Q Can you tell me any more than you have about	transported from where it's generated to where it's
8	the economic purpose they were trying to achieve	applied?
9	with this analysis?	A The only study I've seen that looked at that
10	A I think I've told you all I understand about 11:30AM	was a study done in Maryland by an economist who 11:33AM
11	it.	
		looked at the cost benefit analysis of transporting
12	Q You've endorsed this STP average method to be	litter, and I believe, and I'm reaching far back in
13	used for Rausser and Dicks. Doesn't that mean that	memory here, I believe they found it was at the
14	it could have some validity looking at an entire	current prices of diesel and everything else at the
15	watershed in terms of STPs on an average basis? 11:30AM	time, whatever went into that assessment, they found 11:33AM
16	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	seven miles to be a reasonable distance to move it.
17	A No. It's getting the cart before the horse	Q Have you seen any study similar to that in the
18	here. I mean, it was presented to me from these	Illinois River watershed?
19	authors that they needed to do it this way, and I	A I have not.
20	think we even had a conversation about that's not 11:30AM	Q Let me show you, Dr. Coale, what I'm marking 11:33AM
21	the way it should be done; you can't average things	as Plaintiff's Exhibit 13, but before I do that, as
22	like this; it shouldn't be done that way from a	we went through Appendix A, which was part of
23	scientific rigorous evaluation point of view, and	Exhibit 12, did you see anything in it that had
24	they said, well, we know that but we have to do it	changed from the draft form you originally looked
25	for the economic analysis, and I said, well, then 11:31AM	at? 11:34AM
	339	341
1	let's proceed, but I have a problem with that, and I	A I wasn't doing a word-by-word comparison, but
2	told that to them during the conversation we had.	I didn't notice any change.
3	Q So you told them that you had a problem with	Q Dr. Coale, that just happens to be my copy of
4	the science underlying their assumptions?	the final part of Subpart E that I think you did
5	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:31AM	look at. 11:34AM
6	A I was saying that for the purpose of a	A Okay.
7	scientific evaluation, that's not an adequate	Q Are you familiar with what I've marked as
8	approach, but they told me for their purpose of	Exhibit 13?
9	economic evaluation, they deemed it to be adequate,	A Yes.
10	and I said, well, as long as we understand there's a 11:31AM	Q All right, and I'll represent to you I've 11:35AM
11	difference there, then let's go forward.	extracted that from the final draft of the Rausser
12	Q Your report says you agree with their	and Dicks report. Okay?
13	methodology, not for any economic purpose, but for	A Okay.
14	estimating soil litter estimating poultry litter	Q Because you mentioned it in your report.
15	generation and all of these other things. Are you 11:31AM	Let's look on page the pages are numbered on the 11:35AM
16	willing to stand by the science they have used for	bottom. On the bottom of Page 26, you get the word
17	poultry litter generation, nutrient forage,	the and then you carry over on to 27. The first
18	phosphorus utilization, all of the things in 10C in	question is whether the datasets are accurate, and
19	your report?	the second is whether they are representative, and
20	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 11:32AM	we're talking about Gordon Johnson's datasets here. 11:36AM
21	A For the purposes that they expressed to me,	A Okay.
22	what they wanted to do with it, that's as good as	Q Do you recall that?
23	they needed to have it.	A Yes, I do.
24	Q But you're not willing to stand behind these	Q Okay, and Rausser and Dicks criticized Dr.
25	things scientifically, are you? 11:32AM	Johnson's data as not being representative of the 11:36AM
	340	342

1	entire watershed; is that correct?	routinely?
2	A That's correct.	A Yes and no. Yes, if you're trying just to
3	Q Okay. Maybe before we get there, we ought to	look at large databases of soil tests that other
4	look at the datasets he talks about. Let's go back	people took for varying purposes and applications.
5	to 26, and right under the heading, data errors and 11:36AM	You can look at datasets like this and use them. If 11:38AM
6	deficiencies, it says, he, Dr. Johnson, relies on at	you are trying to do a scientific study, you have to
7	least four datasets. One, two years, 2006 to 2007,	have a much more controlled dataset.
8	of soil tests collected in the Eucha-Spavinaw	Q So for things like finding compliance with the
9	watershed. Did you look at that data yourself?	nutrient management plan, would this kind of data be
10	A I've seen that data. 11:36AM	adequate for farmers? 11:39AM
11	Q Okay. Two, soil test reports, 2000 to 2005,	A I guess it really depends on what defines what
12	submitted by poultry producers who applied poultry	is in compliance versus out of compliance. It may
13	litter to their land and who contracted with two	not.
14	integrators, George's and Tyson. Did you look at	Q Okay. Do you have any reason to believe that
15	that data as well? 11:37AM	it's not as far as either the State of Oklahoma or 11:39AM
16	A I've seen that data.	the State of Arkansas is concerned?
17	Q Okay. Three then is evidently sets of data,	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
18	one from the Oklahoma State University and the other	A I don't know about that.
19	from University of Arkansas, which record tests	Q Okay. Then there was a question of whether or
20	performed over a seven-year period, they say 11:37AM	not the data was representative. 11:39AM
21	principally to assure that excess litter is not	A Correct.
22	applied in recent years, but they were publicly	Q What is your understanding of the reason this
23	available data from Arkansas and Oklahoma that Dr.	data was collected, and if we need to go back, you
24	Johnson looked at.	know, point by point, we can.
25	A Correct. 11:37AM	A In general, the reason data like this is 11:39AM
	343	345
		5.15
1	Q And did you look at that data as well?	collected is by producers, they take soil samples,
2	A Yes, I saw those.	send them to a lab, get the analysis back with
3	Q Okay. Is that kind of soil test data that you	recommendations so they can make management
4	looked at from Dr. Johnson comparable to the kind of	decisions on what to do next on that piece of land.
5	soil test data you look at in Maryland? 11:37AM	Q Okay. Is the sort of data that Dr. Johnson 11:40AM
6	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	looked at representative of the kind of fields that
7	A Look more commonly at the one I don't I	are being tested for that very purpose?
8	don't know if I've ever in the past looked at one	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
9	that was like from the integrator, whole company	Q To make management decisions on those fields?
10	averages and stuff like that. 11:38AM	MR. McDANIEL: Same objection. 11:40AM
11	Q Right.	A I presume they were collected to make
12	A But, yes.	management decisions.
13	Q But in terms of gathering the data in the	Q Okay. So would you be comfortable that they
14	field and sending it to the lab, is it the same kind	fairly represent the fields where people are
15	of data that you look at in Maryland? 11:38AM	collecting data to make management decisions, 11:40AM
16	A Yes.	particularly for phosphorus?
17	Q Do you have any reason to believe that any of	MR. McDANIEL: Object to form.
18	this data that Dr. Johnson looked at is not reliable	A Again, with our premise that the reason you
19	in that it doesn't accurately represent the soil	take a soil sample and send it to a commercial lab
20	being tested? 11:38AM	for commercial analysis to begin with is to make 11:40AM
21	A Well, I suspect they are results from soil	management decisions, then the answer would be yes.
22	test analysis. So, yes, the soil has been tested.	Q And would the same answer be true if you were
23	That's the assumption I had.	sending it to a university lab for the same purpose?
24	Q Okay, and is this the kind of soil test data	A Yes, yes.
25	that people in your profession would work with 11:38AM	Q On Page 29 Rausser and Dicks have a heading 11:41AM
	344	346

1	that says improper statistical techniques. Do you	average could give a false impression?	
2	see that?	A Correct.	
3	A Yes, I do.	Q Turning over to Page 30, do you know which	
4	Q Okay. In the second sentence they say he,	average that Dr. Johnson did, if any, contained in	
5	being Dr. Johnson, asserts that any test sample with 11:41AM	it a negative STP value? 11:44AM	
6	an STP of 65 or above represents a field that has no	A I did see in some of the spreadsheets of data	
7	need of phosphorus. This is simply wrong. Now,	that he had that he referenced negative values.	
8	what's the agronomic limit in Oklahoma?	Q Do you know whether those negative values	
9	A It's set at 65.	ended up in any average he did?	
10	Q Okay. So as far as that goes, Dr. Johnson is 11:42AM	A I have no knowledge on that. 11:44AM	
11	correct, at least for Oklahoma samples?	Q Okay. Same question about values exceeding	
12	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	15,000.	
13	A It says if the agronomic limit in Oklahoma is	A Okay.	
14	65 pound per acre, then above that it would assume	Q Do you know if he did any average in any of	
15	you don't have a need for phosphorus to be applied 11:42AM	his report that included a value of 15,000? 11:44AM	
16	to that field.	A No. Again, I saw values that high in the	
17	Q Okay.	datasets.	
18	A What they're looking at here is the reference	Q Right.	
19	from it was an OSU Extension publication, I	A But whether they were in the report or not, I	
20	believe, that said to ensure that you have 65 pounds 11:42AM	don't know. 11:45AM	
21	per acre STP over every square inch of a field, then	Q If you get the dataset of all of the tests for	
22	to assure that, then you should really have a soil	the whole state, you're going to get a lot of data,	
23	test P level of 120. I think that's what they are	some of which may or may not have been used by Dr.	
24	getting at that there.	Johnson?	
25	Q I think that's what they are getting at that 11:42AM	A I don't recall him specifically saying whether 11:45AM	
	347	349	
1	there, and they also point out that in the state of	or not he gleaned certain numbers out of the dataset	
2	Oklahoma, I'm not sure they say it, but in a	before he did his calculations or not.	
3	nutrient limited watershed, the STP limit is 300.	Q Okay. Would you agree that reading a 15,000	
4	That's something we've talked about before; right?	is a laboratory or sampling error?	
5	A Yes, we have. 11:43AM	A There's some error involved there. It's not 11:45AM	
6	Q Okay. You have looked at Dr. Johnson's report	realistic.	
7	and the data that support it?	Q Or maybe someone sending in just a sample of	
8	A Yes.	fertilizer to be tested?	
9		terunzer to be testeu:	
-	Q Do you think that he was being deceptive to	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's	
10	Q Do you think that he was being deceptive to use 65 as he used it? 11:43AM		
10 11		A There's any number of possibilities, but it's	
10	use 65 as he used it? 11:43AM	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure	
10 11	use 65 as he used it? 11:43AM A No.	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I	
10 11 12	use 65 as he used it? 11:43AM  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure	
10 11 12 13 14 15	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I	
10 11 12 13 14 15	use 65 as he used it? 11:43AM  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM 65 is the established critical level for agronomic response.	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by the acreage involved in each sample, does it make	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM 65 is the established critical level for agronomic response.  Q And where they say he is, therefore,	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by the acreage involved in each sample, does it make his averages completely devoid of any value?	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM 65 is the established critical level for agronomic response.  Q And where they say he is, therefore, deceptive, you disagree with that?	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number.  11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by the acreage involved in each sample, does it make his averages completely devoid of any value?  A It can I've worked with datasets like this.	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM 65 is the established critical level for agronomic response.  Q And where they say he is, therefore, deceptive, you disagree with that?  A I don't think referring to that 65 is a 11:43AM	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by the acreage involved in each sample, does it make his averages completely devoid of any value?  A It can I've worked with datasets like this.  It can make them have a very different meaning. You 11:46AM	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM 65 is the established critical level for agronomic response.  Q And where they say he is, therefore, deceptive, you disagree with that?  A I don't think referring to that 65 is a 11:43AM deceptive practice.	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by the acreage involved in each sample, does it make his averages completely devoid of any value?  A It can I've worked with datasets like this. It can make them have a very different meaning. You 11:46AM can have a very small acreage let's say you have	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM 65 is the established critical level for agronomic response.  Q And where they say he is, therefore, deceptive, you disagree with that?  A I don't think referring to that 65 is a 11:43AM deceptive practice.  Q Okay. Then they talk about using simple	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by the acreage involved in each sample, does it make his averages completely devoid of any value?  A It can I've worked with datasets like this. It can make them have a very different meaning. You 11:46AM can have a very small acreage let's say you have a single acre that you have a soil sample from that	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM 65 is the established critical level for agronomic response.  Q And where they say he is, therefore, deceptive, you disagree with that?  A I don't think referring to that 65 is a 11:43AM deceptive practice.  Q Okay. Then they talk about using simple averages or means after that.	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by the acreage involved in each sample, does it make his averages completely devoid of any value?  A It can I've worked with datasets like this. It can make them have a very different meaning. You 11:46AM can have a very small acreage let's say you have a single acre that you have a soil sample from that might happen to be a loafing level in a pasture	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM 65 is the established critical level for agronomic response.  Q And where they say he is, therefore, deceptive, you disagree with that?  A I don't think referring to that 65 is a 11:43AM deceptive practice.  Q Okay. Then they talk about using simple averages or means after that.  A Right.	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by the acreage involved in each sample, does it make his averages completely devoid of any value?  A It can — I've worked with datasets like this. It can make them have a very different meaning. You 11:46AM can have a very small acreage — let's say you have a single acre that you have a soil sample from that might happen to be a loafing level in a pasture where the STP level is extremely high. Well,	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	use 65 as he used it?  A No.  Q So would you agree with you would disagree with their conclusion in the final sentence of the first paragraph under heading number two?  A No. I believe that the soil test P level of 11:43AM 65 is the established critical level for agronomic response.  Q And where they say he is, therefore, deceptive, you disagree with that?  A I don't think referring to that 65 is a 11:43AM deceptive practice.  Q Okay. Then they talk about using simple averages or means after that.	A There's any number of possibilities, but it's not a realistic number. 11:45AM  Q Okay. They criticized Dr. Johnson for giving equal weight to each observation. I'm not sure which ones they say are plainly erroneous, but I guess they're saying he should have done a weighted average there in the middle of the page. In your 11:46AM view, did his failure to do a weighted average by the acreage involved in each sample, does it make his averages completely devoid of any value?  A It can I've worked with datasets like this. It can make them have a very different meaning. You 11:46AM can have a very small acreage let's say you have a single acre that you have a soil sample from that might happen to be a loafing level in a pasture	

1	P level to that single acre, you're attributing to	Q Okay. If we assume that 65 were about a hair
2	the percent of the entire land area, divided by the	to the right of that
3	number of samples you have. You don't know. So it	A Okay.
4	could be grossly over represented or on the	Q would it be fair to say that the
5	contrary, you could have a single soil sample that 11:47AM	overwhelming majority of those readings would be 11:49AM
6	represents 100 acres that has an STP value that's	above 65?
7	very low, but it may not be representative of the	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form as
8	right proportion of the landscape. So this is	misleading.
9	something that just not in this case but it's	A I would say the majority of those data points
10	many, many times over the years, it's been a problem 11:47AM	represented here would be above 65. 11:50AM
11	of if you are going to use a collection of data	Q Okay. I see a hash mark for 101. If we were
12	regarding soil test analyses numbers and you're	to assume that 100 were the agronomic limit in
13	going to try to make an assumption what it means	Arkansas, would most of the data points represented
14	over a larger land area, you really have to know the	on Figure 6 still be in excess of 100?
15	number of acres that corresponds with each 11:47AM	A From this figure, I'd say yes. 11:50AM
16	individual sample, and that would be an area	Q Okay, and they have a hash mark along the X
17	weighted sample. If you don't, you can have some	axis for 120, do they not?
18	very misleading answers come out. That's a flaw.	A Yes.
19	Q Okay. Let's look at Page 32, if we could,	Q Okay. Assuming the 120 might have some value
20	please, Figure 6. Now, this is something that 11:47AM	in our analysis, are most of the data points 11:50AM
21	Rausser and Dicks did rather than something Dr.	represented on Figure 6 in excess of 120?
22	Johnson did; right?	A That's getting to the point where I'm less
23 24	A Yes. That's what I understand.	confident to say yes or no because you really have
25	Q All right, and do I understand correctly that they used basically the Benton and Washington County 11:48AM	to count the observations. It's getting it's not
<b>4</b> 5	they used basically the Benton and Washington County 11:48AM 351	clearly as obvious whether it is or not as you work 11:51AM 353
	331	333
1	data that Dr. Johnson had gathered from Arkansas?	your way up the right of this X axis.
2	A That's what I understand the caption to say,	Q Do you understand that each bar here to be a
3	yes.	separate observation?
4	Q And would you be willing to trust that Rausser	A No. I believe each bar the height of the
5	and Dicks correctly plotted that on their graph, 11:48AM	bar represents how many observations of that value. 11:51AM
6	which is Figure 6?	Q Okay. What is the median then on Figure 6;
7	A I didn't independently verify it.	what does that mean?
8	Q Okay. Fair enough. First of all, do you see	A That if you rank all the observations from the
9	on this particular graph any value of 15,000 showing	least to the greatest in value, that would be the
10	up? 11:48AM	middle point in that ranking. 11:51AM
11	A No, sir. It's off the range of the scale.	Q All right. Does that mean that from the
12	Q Okay, and do you see any value that's	median, there are as many observations less than the
13	negative?	median as there are above the median?
14	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's misleading. 11:49AM	A That's what it would mean.
15 16		Q Okay, and if the median is in excess of 120, 11:52AM could we then conclude that there are more than half
17	Q Okay. Do you see any value shown on their graph that would indicate a negative STP?	at least that are in excess of 120?
18	MR. McDANIEL: Same objection.	A Yes, you can conclude that.
19	A The X axis scale doesn't go below I assume	Q And so back to my question a moment ago. Most
20	it goes to zero. It doesn't go below two indicated 11:49AM	of the values shown on this Figure 6 are going to be 11:52AM
21	here.	above 120?
22	Q Now, explain to me, if you would, please	A Yes.
23	well, do you see along the bottom, along the X axis	Q They talk the text below Figure 6 about the
24	a hash mark of 63?	four Oklahoma counties, and Sequoyah gets put back
25	A Yes. 11:49AM	in; do you see that; Adair, Cherokee, Delaware and 11:53AM
	352	354

1	Sequoyah?	Q Okay, and we don't know to what extent it
2	A I see that list, yeah.	occurs?
3	Q Do you know why they put Sequoyah in here but	A Correct.
4	left it out of the last exhibit we talked about with	Q Or at least you don't?
5	STPs and chickens and turkeys and all of that? 11:53AM	A I don't. 11:56AM
6	A I have no idea.	Q And we don't know anybody who does?
7	Q Back to chickens and turkeys a minute. Do	A I don't know what you know.
8	turkeys poop more or less than chickens?	Q Dr. Coale, are you aware that regulators in
9	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	the state of Arkansas have determined that
10	A With the assumption that their excrement is 11:53AM	Washington and Benton Counties have a surplus of 11:57AM
11	related to body size, I would expect it to be more.	nutrients produced in those counties over and above
12	Q Okay. Is that something that you have studied	what is needed there?
13	or quantified or worked with in your work?	A I've not seen that information.
14	A No, sir.	Q Would it surprise you if I represented that to
15	Q But just a common sense assumption knowing how 11:54AM	you is the case? 11:57AM
16	big a turkey is and how big a chicken is?	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
17	A That's my assumption.	A I would be more comfortable if I read it in a
18	Q Okay, and do I remember correctly that you	publication somewhere.
19	said Rausser and Dicks looked like they left turkeys	Q But nobody in helping you get ready in all of
20	out of Exhibit 12, Appendix A? 11:54AM	these WebEx conferences offered that to you, did 11:57AM
21	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	they?
22	A I believe one of the footnotes indicated that	A Not that I recall.
23	turkeys were omitted.	Q Have you seen a paper by a scientist named
24	Q Okay. On Page 33, the first full paragraph,	Slanton (sic) from Arkansas in about 2004 that came
25	they have a sentence that says, the rate of poultry 11:54AM	to that conclusion? 11:57AM
	355	357
1	litter production in the IRW is adequate but not	A I don't recall.
2	excessive to meet these needs, and I assume they're	Q Okay. On Page 33, Dr. Coale, the final
3	talking about the needs for phosphorus.	heading is changing regulatory environment, and
4	Approximately one million tons of litter would be	Rausser and Dicks say that Dr. Johnson takes no
5	required to cover all of the forage-producing 11:55AM	account of the changing litter application practices 11:58AM
6	491,246 acres of hay and pasture in the five-county	in the IRW which have been implemented over recent
7	area each year. Now we're back to only five	years, and they detail in, I guess, Section 6 of
8	counties. Is that, once again, assuming that every	their report what they consider to be changing
9	pasture acre in the watershed is going to get two	regulatory environment about litter. Did you look
10	tons of litter? 11:55AM	at the substantive part of their report that dealt 11:58AM
11	A That's my assumption, that they made that	with the changing regulatory environment?
12	assumption, a double assumption. That's my	A No, I did not.
13	understanding that that's the assumption they made.	Q Okay. Are you in agreement then with them in
14	Q Okay. Is that assumption realistic in the	the very last sentence of their paragraph on
15	real world? 11:55AM	changing regulatory environment that Dr. Johnson's 11:59AM
16	A In the real world, I wouldn't expect even	failure to consider the effect of those changes
17	distribution of litter over every acre uniformly.	renders his conclusions worthless?
18	Q And I think we talked about yesterday nobody	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. It's
19	has gathered data about the number of acres in the	outside the scope of his report.
20	watershed that have an unmet need for litter? 11:56AM	A I haven't even considered their discussion of 11:59AM
21	A Not that I know of.	the changes in regulatory environment.
22	Q Okay. Would it be fair to assume that there	Q Okay. So you certainly can't vouch for their
23	are some pasture acres in the watershed where the	assessment that Dr. Johnson's work is worthless
24	owner or the operator doesn't want litter?	because he didn't consider it?
25	A I would suspect that occurs, yes. 11:56AM	A No. That part I didn't even consider. 11:59AM
	356	358

1	Q And so in Paragraph 10C of your report where	Q Okay. I'm going to read to you what you said
2	you say you reviewed Section E of the Rausser and	in 10C about their Appendix A, which was Exhibit 12.
3	Dicks report, which is what we've been talking about	I agree with the methodology used as outlined in
4	as Exhibit 13	Appendix A to estimate poultry litter generation,
5	A Right, correct. 11:59AM	forage nutrient P utilization, baseline soil test P 12:02PM
6	Q you're going to exempt from your agreement	values, soil test P response to poultry litter
7	with that any conclusion that his work is worthless	application to pastureland and poultry litter
8	because he didn't consider the regulatory	available for P-based land application in the IRW.
9	environment?	Do you see that?
10	A Right. 11:59AM	A Yes, I see that. 12:02PM
11	MR. McDANIEL: I object. I object to the	Q And they didn't do any statistically valid
12	form. His report says what part of Section E he	field tests, did they?
13	considered. It speaks for itself.	A Well, probably that was my mistake when I
14	MR. PAGE: I thought we weren't going to do	wrote this by not prefacing by saying for the
15	speaking objections, Scott. I was in a deposition 12:00PM	purposes of their broad brush economic evaluation, 12:02PM
16	the other day with Dr. Stevenson, and I was advised	that I thought their methodology was fine. I
17	that if I said anything beyond object to the form,	probably should have been more specific to what I
18	that was improper. I've noticed in the three hours	was referring to.
19	I've been here today or two and a half hours, you've	Q Because in the report that you wrote and you
20	gone well beyond that in your objections. Is it 12:00PM	submitted, you're a lot harder on Dr. Johnson than 12:03PM
21	going to be your practice to continue giving these	you are on Rausser and Dicks, aren't you?
22	speaking objections during depositions of your	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
23	experts?	A I wouldn't call it being hard or not being
24	MR. McDANIEL: You can say whatever you	hard. I just I interpreted what Dr. Dicks and
25	want on the Record, David. I'm not going to get in 12:00PM	Rausser was doing as being a lighter, less rigorous 12:03PM
	359	361
1	an argument with you. Go ahead. Next question.	evaluation for economic purposes, which we commonly
2	Q Let's look at Paragraph 10D of your report,	see, and I interpreted what Dr. Johnson was doing as
3	which is there on 17, Dr. Coale, and let's look at	being a scientific evaluation of data, which you
4	the last two sentences of that paragraph, and	have to take much more care doing that.
5	it's you're talking about Section E of the 12:01PM	Q Okay.
6	Rausser and Dicks report in that paragraph, are you	A I think two people had different objectives,
7	not?	different goals and different uses, even if they
8	A Okay, correct.	were using the same data.
9	Q Okay, and conclude with any sampling plan or	Q Your last sentence in 10D, Dr. Johnson did not
10	area excuse me. Any estimation of the soil P 12:01PM	utilize statistically valid approaches to estimating 12:03PM
11	status of the IRW must begin with a statistically	the soil test P status in the IRW.
12	valid field sampling plan or an area-weighted soil	A That's correct.
13	type specific and management history specific data	Q Rausser and Dicks did not use statistically
14	collection plan. Did I read that correctly?	valid approaches for estimating the soil test P
15	A Yes, you did. 12:01PM	status in the IRW either, did they? 12:04PM
16	Q Did Rausser and Dicks do that?	A For their purposes.
17	A No, sir.	Q Answer my question, please.
18	Q And yet you approved their methodology, didn't	A No, they did not.
19	you?	Q Yet you agree with their methodology?
20	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. 12:01PM	A For their purposes. 12:04PM
21	A I talked about the methodology we talked about	Q You were their scientific advisor for soil
22	earlier was that how they approached to do their	test matters; right?
23	economic analysis. This is referring to if you are	A I was not their advisor. They ran their plan
24	going to do a scientifically rigorous evaluation,	by me to see whether they could if they were
25	you have to follow a different procedure. 12:02PM	going to do this broad brush economic evaluation, 12:04PM

1	did I think their approach and methodology was	in the United States of America that has an
2	valid, and I said yes, and that's about the extent	environmental water quality problem because of
3	of our conversation.	phosphorus from poultry litter?
4	Q So you would not want the court to think that	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.
5	you have validated the scientific component of their 12:04PM	A I believe that where there are water quality 12:08PM
6	Appendix A based upon what you wrote in your report?	problems due to elevated phosphorus levels in water,
7	MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	there are cases where poultry has been implicated as
8	A I believe if you are going to do a scientific,	one of the possible sources.
9	rigorous scientific evaluation and try to get a	Q Is the Illinois River watershed one of those
10	defensible number, you could not use the approach 12:05PM	watersheds where it's been implicated as a potential 12:08PM
11	they used.	source?
12	Q 10E, Dr. Gordon Johnson's poorly justified and	A I believe it has.
13	all-inclusive conclusion that application of poultry	Q Dr. Coale, is there any watershed in the
14	litter to grass pastures in the IRW constitutes poor	United States that you're aware of where the
15	agronomic practice is not useful when the goal of 12:05PM	employment of a phosphorus index has improved water 12:08PM
16	water quality protection is dependent on	quality?
17	implementation in changes in farm management. Well,	A Not specifically.
18	here you are expressing an opinion on water quality.	MR. NANCE: Let's take a quick break.
19	A No, I'm not. I'm saying that	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now off the Record.
20	Q On the on farm management necessary to 12:05PM	The time is 12:10 p.m. 12:08PM
21	ensure the goals of water quality protection?	(Following a short recess at 12:10
22	A Right.	p.m., proceedings continued on the Record at 12:17
23	Q So the P risk index is the quantifies the	p.m.)
24	or tries to, the risk or the danger of phosphorus	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the Record.
25	causing a water quality problem; right? 12:06PM	The time is 12:17 p.m. 12:15PM
	363	365
1	A What it does is	Q Dr. Coale, is poultry litter used after it
2	Q Well, does the P risk index try to quantify	becomes litter any further in raising poultry?
3	the risk of phosphorus injury to water?	A It can be.
4	A Okay. What is a P risk index?	Q How?
5	Q A phosphorus index. 12:06PM	A As a fertilizer for grain crops that are being 12:16PM
6	A Okay. A phosphorus site index is designed to	fed back to the poultry.
7	evaluate the relative risk for phosphorus movement	Q Is that the only way it could be used?
8	off of a site, off of a field.	A That's the only way that comes to mind right
9	Q And to water?	now to me.
10	A The degree of conductivity of that field to a 12:06PM	Q All right. Sir, have you done any 12:16PM
11	water body is assessed when you are doing the	consultation with farmers or poultry producers in
12	phosphorus index evaluation.	the IRW?
13	Q And the degree of conductivity is assessed	A No, sir.
14	because you are trying to find out the risk of	Q Okay. Have you done any consultation with
15	phosphorus leaving that field and getting to water? 12:07PM	farmers or poultry producers in all of Oklahoma or 12:17PM
16	A Correct.	Arkansas?
17	Q Dr. Coale, is there based upon your study	A No, sir.
17 18	Q Dr. Coale, is there based upon your study and knowledge and expertise, is there any watershed	A No, sir.  Q Have you made any extension-type presentations
17 18 19	Q Dr. Coale, is there based upon your study and knowledge and expertise, is there any watershed in America that has an environmental problem, a	A No, sir.  Q Have you made any extension-type presentations in either Oklahoma or Arkansas?
17 18 19 20	Q Dr. Coale, is there based upon your study and knowledge and expertise, is there any watershed in America that has an environmental problem, a water quality problem because of poultry litter 12:07PM	A No, sir.  Q Have you made any extension-type presentations in either Oklahoma or Arkansas?  A The only time I can imagine would have been I 12:17PM
17 18 19 20 21	Q Dr. Coale, is there based upon your study and knowledge and expertise, is there any watershed in America that has an environmental problem, a water quality problem because of poultry litter phosphorus?	A No, sir.  Q Have you made any extension-type presentations in either Oklahoma or Arkansas?  A The only time I can imagine would have been I 12:17PM was at a conference in Fayetteville maybe seven
17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Dr. Coale, is there based upon your study and knowledge and expertise, is there any watershed in America that has an environmental problem, a water quality problem because of poultry litter phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.	A No, sir.  Q Have you made any extension-type presentations in either Oklahoma or Arkansas?  A The only time I can imagine would have been I 12:17PM was at a conference in Fayetteville maybe seven years ago, but it wasn't an extension-type
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Dr. Coale, is there based upon your study and knowledge and expertise, is there any watershed in America that has an environmental problem, a water quality problem because of poultry litter phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I've not seen that data, no.	A No, sir.  Q Have you made any extension-type presentations in either Oklahoma or Arkansas?  A The only time I can imagine would have been I 12:17PM was at a conference in Fayetteville maybe seven years ago, but it wasn't an extension-type presentation. It wasn't to farmers or growers.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q Dr. Coale, is there based upon your study and knowledge and expertise, is there any watershed in America that has an environmental problem, a water quality problem because of poultry litter phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form. A I've not seen that data, no. Q So in all of your expertise and your teaching	A No, sir.  Q Have you made any extension-type presentations in either Oklahoma or Arkansas?  A The only time I can imagine would have been I 12:17PM was at a conference in Fayetteville maybe seven years ago, but it wasn't an extension-type presentation. It wasn't to farmers or growers.  Q Did you make did you present a paper or
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Dr. Coale, is there based upon your study and knowledge and expertise, is there any watershed in America that has an environmental problem, a water quality problem because of poultry litter phosphorus?  MR. McDANIEL: Object to the form.  A I've not seen that data, no.	A No, sir.  Q Have you made any extension-type presentations in either Oklahoma or Arkansas?  A The only time I can imagine would have been I 12:17PM was at a conference in Fayetteville maybe seven years ago, but it wasn't an extension-type presentation. It wasn't to farmers or growers.

1 2 3 445567 8 9 9 1 1 2 2 2 4 4 5	
1 2 3 4 5 5 6 7 6 8 7 8 9 9 2 1 3 4 5 6 7 6 8 7 8 9 9 2 1 3 4 5 6 7 6 8 7 8 9 9 0 2 3	

I can't remember if I presented or not or CERTIFICATE whether I just attended. STATE OF OKLAHOMA ) Okay. Have you had any consultations with employees of the State of Arkansas about this COUNTY OF TULSA lawsuit? 12:17PM A Not that I know of. I, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, Certified Have you done any work that's been used by Shorthand Reporter within and for Tulsa County, anyone else in this case or have you looked at State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that the above anything in this case that we haven't already talked named witness was by me first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about in your deposition? 12:18PM in the case aforesaid, and that I reported in I believe I provided everything I considered. stenograph his deposition; that my stenograph notes Well, Dr. Coale, I don't think I have anything Q were thereafter transcribed and reduced to else. typewritten form under my supervision, as the same MR. McDANIEL: On behalf of Peterson, I appears herein. don't have any questions. Shaking heads in the 12:18PM I further certify that the foregoing 114 room. Anyone on the phone? Bob? Anyone else have pages contain a full, true and correct transcript of the deposition taken at such time and place. questions for the witnesses? I further certify that I am not attorney MR. SANDERS: No questions here. for or relative to either of said parties, or MR. McDANIEL: Dr. Coale wants to read and otherwise interested in the event of said action. 12:19PM sign, and you can send it to me, please, Lisa. WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL this 20th day VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes the of January, 2009. deposition of Frank Coale. We are now off the LISA A. STEINMEYER, CRR Record. The time is 12:20 p.m. CSR No. 386 (Whereupon, the hearing was recessed at 12:20 p.m.) 12:19PM 369 367 CORRECTIONS TO THE DEPOSITION OF SIGNATURE PAGE FRANK COALE, PhD I, Frank Coale, PhD, do hereby certify Volume II that the foregoing deposition was presented to me by PAGE AND LINE NUMBER CORRECTION Lisa A. Steinmeyer as a true and correct transcript of the proceedings in the above styled and numbered cause, and I now sign the same as true and correct. WITNESS my hand this \_ \_, 2009. FRANK COALE, PhD SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me this day of \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2009. Notary Public My Commission Expires: 23 24 25 368 370

371

## A

ability 282:5 **able** 261:9,16 271:10 338:7 absolutely 267:12 acceleration 265:21 accepted 275:25 account 264:6 314:6 358:5 accounted 264:8 305:3 accounting 320:11 accuracy 304:1 accurate 301:17 302:3,13,19 342:18 accurately 304:20 344:19 achieve 272:3 330:3 339:8 acidic 263:22 acknowledge 294:24 acre 258:14 264:17 267:15,22 267:24 268:25 269:6,18 277:25 297:6 298:8 320:5 324:8 328:2 329:6,11,17 332:23 333:14,21,22,24 334:9 335:2 347:14,21 350:22 351:1 356:9,17 acreage 324:7 350:17,21 acres 295:22 296:11 322:17 322:17,18 324:2 327:10 330:20,24 333:8,15,23 334:2 335:11,24 351:6,15 356:6,19,23 act 325:20 action 369:21 active 325:11.13 actual 301:16,22,24 311:20 320:10 336:14 **Adair** 303:10 321:8 354:25 added 259:5 adding 266:20 **addition** 305:14 **additional** 266:20 269:24 332:10 additive 335:12 336:7 adequacy 291:9 adequate 335:17 340:7,9 345:10 356:1

adjoining 263:17 adjust 264:6 281:25 admit 287:1 318:20 advise 291:19,25 advised 281:12 359:16 **advisor** 338:2 362:21,23 affirmative 308:13 aforesaid 369:11 **ag** 337:18 **ago** 295:11 328:24 354:19 366:22 agree 300:10 301:1 305:6 313:12 337:5 340:12 348:12 350:3 361:3 362:19 agreeable 292:9 agreed 293:20 agreement 303:4 337:12 358:13 359:6 agricultural 291:14 300:17 303:8,13,17 304:8 321:13 323:5 336:10 agricultural-related 294:1 **Agriculture** 295:19,23 **agronomic** 259:8 264:10,12 264:17,24 265:1 266:18 267:1 300:6,7 338:18 347:8 347:13 348:16 353:12 363:15 **agronomically** 259:1 265:11 ahead 287:3 288:10,11 331:14 360:1 al 254:11 279:5 allow 259:7 allowance 304:20 **allowed** 269:15 **allows** 327:3 all-inclusive 363:13 **America** 364:19 365:1 **amount** 259:1 271:9,10 275:7 296:21 298:9 303:1 305:15 309:22 316:4,5 317:5 319:9 322:5 327:16 330:21 332:11 amounts 297:8 **AmSouth** 255:18

analyses 351:12

**analysis** 258:13 263:10 286:2 288:25 289:16 293:13,15 297:15,16 301:7 307:11 309:1 320:4 328:10 337:17 337:20 338:16.23.24 339:9 339:25 341:11 344:22 346:2 346:20 353:20 360:23 **analyze** 293:16 **anecdotal** 323:16,22 animal 324:17 338:14 **annual** 310:13 315:16,23 316:5 319:24 320:7 **annually** 303:10 313:23 answer 275:24 276:1 318:3,7 318:22,23 330:4,6 346:21 346:22 362:17 answered 275:22 answering 284:1 289:8 318:2 329:25 **answers** 351:18 **anticipate** 289:22,25 anybody 260:25 323:23 357:6 anyway 283:10 **apologize** 264:13 334:5 **Apparently** 315:19 **appear** 292:1 310:4 329:10 **appears** 286:7 309:1 328:18 369:15 **Appendix** 290:2,7,11,14,18 290:24,25 293:7,11 294:3 294:24 304:10 309:19 331:23 337:6 341:22 355:20 361:2,4 363:6 **application** 269:8 270:7,13 271:16,19 277:11 284:20 297:11,24 298:4 306:4 316:6 328:7,23 333:6 337:9 337:11 358:5 361:7,8 363:13 applications 268:9,21 269:14 328:21 345:4 **applied** 271:14,25 315:3 316:12 318:10,12 319:8 325:14,18,20 329:4,19,24

Page 143 of 166

334:1,10 335:10,24 338:13 341:8 343:12,22 347:15 **apply** 259:7 260:18,23 263:6 263:9 269:21 270:17,22,22 271:10 277:9 300:16.21 306:23 334:16 338:8 **approach** 258:12 285:24 293:21 296:15 315:8 337:24 340:8 363:1,10 approached 360:22 **approaches** 362:10,14 **appropriate** 264:2 275:17 **approved** 360:18 **approximately** 305:18 306:7 313:4,14,15,22 316:11 317:12 318:13 324:16,21 329:1 330:2,11 333:5 356:4 approximation 291:18 302:15 306:21 approximations 293:17 **AR** 255:15 area 273:7,23 277:5 297:21 302:10 306:8 309:22 312:1 312:3 313:15,21 314:2,3,11 315:15 324:2 326:20,20,21 351:2,14,16 356:7 360:10 areas 279:4 301:8 322:11,15 324:23 327:4,5 328:4 area-weighted 360:12 **arguing** 275:16 argument 360:1 arid 276:24 **Arkansas** 261:11,12,18,19 262:8 263:7,12 264:12 267:3 273:2 304:4 305:3,8 305:12 309:10,16 312:20 313:21 314:3,4,7 315:1 343:19,23 345:16 352:1 353:13 357:9,24 366:16,19 367:4 arrived 312:15 327:18 332:1 332:8,18,24 article 279:8,9,11,14,17 280:4.8 aside 309:10

asked 272:19 275:10 280:24 285:7,13,23,23 286:21 293:18 308:2 asking 263:15 272:23,24 275:18 284:17 297:17.18 assembled 304:16 assert 301:15 assertions 326:11,12 **asserts** 347:5 **assessed** 265:5 364:11,13 assessment 259:18,19 262:11 284:12 291:13,17 341:2,15 358:23 assessments 262:13 291:21 338:8 **assume** 300:18 301:24,25 312:5 318:14 319:7,20 321:24 328:25 332:9 347:14 352:19 353:1,12 356:2,22 **assumed** 297:24 314:12 322:13,19 assuming 298:17 299:13 313:8,9 318:9 320:1,11 334:14 353:19 356:8 **assumption** 284:24,25 285:22 286:1 291:17 296:6 298:1 299:4,6,12,18 306:10 320:6 320:25 321:12 322:1,19 323:18 335:9 338:11 339:2 339:3 344:23 351:13 355:10 355:15,17 356:11,12,12,13 356:14 assumptions 285:13,14,16,19 285:21 291:12,21 292:3 295:19 297:16 298:19 300:11 301:1 302:16 327:12 327:16 335:14 337:19 338:25 339:1,4 340:4 341:2 **assure** 343:21 347:22 attained 259:9 attended 367:2 attention 283:10 attorney 254:5 255:7,11,14 255:17 369:19 attorneys 255:4 281:1,2,4,6

attribute 278:3 attributing 350:25 351:1 **audience** 281:22 **Austin** 282:12 **authors** 339:19 available 265:19 296:24 302:14 303:11 304:5 312:17 316:5 324:8 328:13 337:10 338:12 343:23 361:8 average 284:3 295:21 296:9 298:7,16 301:7,10 302:9,12 306:17,20,22 309:2,4 324:1 324:6,8 328:4 329:3,18 333:24 334:8 335:1,3 336:15 337:8 338:18 339:12 339:15,21 341:6 349:1,4,9 349:14 350:15,16 averages 344:10 348:23 350:18 aware 261:5 264:15 272:6,8 279:20 302:1 324:24 328:9 357:8 365:14 axis 352:19,23 353:17 354:1 **a.m** 257:2,5 292:12,14,15,17 331:16,18,19,21 B **B** 259:25 260:14.23 261:2 309:7 311:24 313:9 back 291:8 292:16 306:8 311:13 313:3 314:21 317:3 331:20 335:3 341:12 343:4 345:23 346:2 354:19,24 355:7 356:7 365:24 366:6 backwards 315:2 **bad** 265:16

**badger** 275:17

**band** 317:18

bar 354:2,4,5

badgering 273:22

balance 271:12 272:4

based 265:18 277:11 295:18

297:7 327:15 328:24 333:7

333:14 335:8 363:6 364:17

**baseline** 297:9 328:11,16,25

Page 144 of 166

332:13 334:14 337:8 361:5 **Bob** 257:8,19 275:9 333:9 **basic** 284:19 367:16 basically 285:9,16 293:21 **bodies** 324:24 332:12,14 336:18 351:25 **body** 281:22 355:11 364:11 **basing** 277:10 **bold** 310:7 basis 260:10,11 265:15 272:5 **books** 304:6 **border** 261:11,12 303:12 318:2,2 320:7,22 323:3,17 324:7 326:12 **Boston** 255:11 333:5 339:15 **bottom** 262:5 316:24 342:16 **Bates** 286:4,17 287:7 342:16 352:23 **boundary** 263:14,25 264:3,5 bear 295:14 **beef** 289:23 324:13 Box 255:18 **brain** 317:11 began 257:1 314:20 beginning 295:16,17 303:11 **branch** 303:15 305:20 337:15 break 281:12 292:9 294:12 **begins** 313:13 365:18 behalf 254:16 261:23 367:14 **briefly** 277:18 believe 263:9 268:3 280:10 **bring** 282:5 281:10 282:9,13 283:21 **broad** 272:10 291:3 300:15 284:10 285:11 292:2,23 361:15 362:25 299:13 301:4,16,25 305:10 **broilers** 312:19 307:7 322:23 323:7 341:12 **broke** 267:14 341:13 344:17 345:14 **brought** 317:16,17 347:20 348:15 354:4 355:22 **Bruce** 283:2 363:8 365:5,12 367:11 **brush** 291:3 361:15 362:25 **benefit** 273:19 341:11 **budgets** 289:16,23 **Benton** 304:4 321:9 351:25 business 336:3 357:10  $\mathbf{C}$ best 261:1 308:24 326:5 C 254:6 255:1,14 257:14 **better** 270:3 309:19 316:3 317:4 318:9 beyond 295:4 359:17,20 369:1.1 **big** 337:24 355:16,16 calcareous 263:23 **bigger** 263:16 calculate 298:6 302:8,23 Billy 283:19 315:13 323:8 333:1 biologist 273:6 calculated 336:14 **bird** 304:16 310:13 316:19,25 **calculation** 301:17 302:2 317:24 318:4 317:8 319:13,15 320:21 **birds** 304:4 307:3,20,23 321:18 331:5 309:21 310:2,8 311:25 **calculations** 285:8,10 339:5 313:14,21 314:2,10 315:1 350:2 315:13,14,16,20 316:11 **calculator** 317:13,16,17 **blanks** 307:5 308:11,18 calibrated 277:14 311:15 **call** 284:10 294:18 335:20 **blindly** 279:2,18 361:23 **blunders** 291:20

called 282:4 293:25 calls 281:5 282:24 283:12,15 **Cal-Maine** 255:17 257:19 **capacity** 254:5,7 **caption** 352:2 care 362:4 career 280:18 Cargill 255:6 257:16 282:21 carry 342:17 cart 339:17 case 262:17 273:24 283:22 287:17 289:1 299:17 307:16 307:19 308:23 310:17 351:9 357:15 367:8,9 369:11 cases 310:9 311:2,3,4 365:7 cash 338:9,9 casual 273:12,14 277:4 catch 290:22 317:11 categorically 301:15 **categories** 267:14,16,17,19 267:20,23 270:3 category 268:6 270:4,14,24 271:15 272:4 278:4,9,19 **cattle** 289:23 324:10,13,22 327:4,8,11 cause 254:17 368:7 **causing** 363:25 census 295:19,22 303:7 304:7 304:8 312:16 315:14,21 316:11 central 301:18 302:3,7 certain 263:20 264:3 265:4 285:12 307:4 326:11 337:19 350:1 certainly 289:10 300:11 323:21 337:21 358:22 certainty 321:25 Certificate 256:7 certified 254:20,21 369:6 **certify** 368:3 369:8,16,19 chance 289:9 290:4 **change** 263:22 281:15 288:7 292:8 331:13 342:2 **changed** 288:3,8 290:20 341:24

changes 263:19 291:25 358:16,21 363:17 **changing** 358:3,5,8,11,15 characteristic 264:3 characteristics 262:12.13 284:1 **check** 311:12 **checked** 319:15 322:8 checking 271:21 **chemical** 274:13 **Cherokee** 303:10 321:8 354:25 **chicken** 312:19 355:16 **chickens** 303:9,18,21 305:7 310:13,19 312:2,18 355:5,7 355:8 **choose** 310:23 **circuit** 296:14 cite 279:5 322:18 City 254:18 classes 273:9 Clay 283:19,23 287:8,10 294:2.2 315:13.25 316:9 323:8,11,17,22 324:20,25 325:4 clear 281:23,24 clearly 281:14 314:9 353:25 clients 308:10,14,16 close 290:7 322:11 **closed** 297:8 322:16 325:24 326:1 Coale 254:15 256:4 257:4,21 258:2 260:8 266:17 272:3 272:11 273:25 280:11 283:4 286:5,17 287:5,23 288:16 289:14,21 291:4 292:7,22 293:3,5 294:15 295:12 297:23 304:6 305:2 318:20 320:25 326:19 331:22 337:5 341:6,20 342:3 357:8 358:2 360:3 364:17 365:13 366:1 367:12,19,22 368:3,12 370:1 Coast 276:25 Code 261:10,17

colleague 318:21 **collected** 321:8,11 343:8 345:23 346:1,11 collecting 346:15 **collection** 351:11 360:14 **College** 255:15 **combine** 262:13 **combined** 262:19 come 306:2 319:13 351:18 comes 312:12 325:23 366:8 comfort 292:9 **comfortable** 273:7 346:13 357:17 comment 283:4 292:2 commercial 328:19,20 346:19,20 Commission 368:23 **common** 262:5,7,10 322:9,20 322:23 355:15 **commonly** 344:7 362:1 community 279:1 **company** 344:9 comparable 344:4 compare 260:9,15 **comparing** 258:17 260:3,19 278:12 298:7 **comparison** 290:6 337:3 342:1 completely 350:18 **compliance** 345:8,12,12 component 363:5 **components** 279:3,19 **composed** 263:13 **computations** 311:20 333:18 computer 282:6 concentration 265:25 concentrations 276:15 concept 275:1 276:8 **concepts** 273:12,14 289:13 conceptual 260:7 concerned 345:16 conclude 354:16,18 360:9 concludes 367:21 **concluding** 259:23 289:3 **conclusion** 348:13 357:25

359:7 363:13 conclusions 358:17 **conduct** 258:12 **conductivity** 364:10,13 conference 281:5 282:2,6.8 282:23 283:14,23 294:18 366:21 **conferences** 281:20 282:18 282:20 283:5 357:20 **confidence** 336:19,22 confident 353:23 confidential 292:21 confidentiality 292:23 confirm 292:21 confusing 329:15 consensus 279:2 **consequently** 312:5 319:17 320:3 conservative 330:8 **consider** 259:12 262:25 264:23 294:10 329:18 358:8 358:16,24,25 359:8 considered 264:12 358:20 359:13 367:11 considering 320:15 **constant** 310:20 314:13 315:15 319:22 320:1 constitutes 363:14 consultant 305:16 316:8,9 328:8 **consultants** 291:2 295:20 296:6 consultation 323:8 366:11,14 consultations 367:3 **contain** 369:17 contained 349:4 **content** 306:16 context 299:20,21 330:7 **continue** 359:21 **continued** 256:5 257:25 292:14 331:18 365:22 contracted 343:13 contrary 351:5 controlled 345:7 conventional 276:8

304:13,15,17,21,25 309:11

**court** 254:1 328:10,14 363:4

351:25 369:4,7

286:4 295:13

**course** 306:12

couple 281:19 283:13,14

375 **conversation** 283:18,19,20 **cover** 356:5 345:5 349:17 350:19 284:7,16 339:20 340:2 covered 293:3 **David** 255:3 257:10 359:25 day 254:17 359:16 368:8,18 363:3 **cow** 326:8 **conversion** 267:25 269:2 **cows** 303:18 369:22 **copies** 286:25 287:4 create 275:13 310:12,24 deal 273:13 copy 279:13 342:3 315:6,22 **dealt** 358:10 deceptive 348:9,19,21 corn 303:17 **created** 321:22 correct 258:23 259:23 260:2 critical 279:4 348:16 **decided** 312:23 260:4 262:21 264:22 265:9 criticized 342:24 350:11 **decision** 265:8 276:10 decisions 300:16 346:4,9,12 266:25 268:10,12,15,23 **crop** 266:23,23 270:11,23 269:11 270:6 271:23 278:1 271:7,8 277:13 284:21 346:15,21 278:13,21 290:12,16 293:4 **crops** 366:5 decrease 273:17 274:3 cross 264:3,5 294:19 296:4,12 297:22 decreased 272:13 298:18 302:25 307:18 CRR 369:24 **deemed** 328:10 340:9 311:10 312:7 313:8 314:4 **CSR** 369:24 **deeply** 267:8 defecation 324:22 325:8 327:22 336:12 343:1 current 290:25 295:21 343:2,25 345:21 347:11 305:15 315:12 336:16 defendant 305:25 349:2 357:3 359:5 360:8 341:14 **defendants** 254:12 257:15,17 362:12 364:16 368:5,7 currently 301:16 257:20 261:24 272:19 305:17 307:16,19 316:9 369:17 cut 281:11 **CORRECTION** 370:3 cycle 270:20,23 defensible 363:10 **CORRECTIONS** 370:1 deficiencies 343:6 D correctly 258:18 264:24 **defined** 267:2 **D** 256:1 258:9 287:20 265:22 266:17 268:9 269:17 **defines** 345:11 danger 363:24 278:10 351:24 352:5 355:18 degree 364:10,13 data 262:22 265:18 268:18 360:14 **Delaware** 303:10 321:8 268:19 269:23 277:5 295:18 **correctness** 291:9 305:21 354:25 295:19.23 296:5.23 301:16 demand 270:11 320:8 327:11 301:22,24,25 302:1,14 correspondence 294:20,21 demands 335:1 303:8 304:3,3 307:3,4 308:6 corresponds 351:15 demonstrate 263:3 308:7,10,12,24 310:9,10,12 cost 341:11 **dependent** 271:2 327:12 310:13,17,23,25 311:12,13 counsel 257:6 287:4 318:21 363:16 312:16 314:12,22 315:7 **count** 353:24 **depends** 259:11 263:14 321:8,11,15,22,23,23 335:7 counties 304:4 309:9,10,16 276:22 311:2,4 345:11 335:13 337:2 342:25 343:5 **deposited** 274:14,19 309:16 310:14 311:11,17 343:9,10,15,16,17,23 344:1 **deposition** 254:15 257:1,4 312:20,21 313:6 321:9,10 344:3,5,13,15,18,24 345:9 354:24 356:8 357:10,11 359:15 367:10,22 368:4 345:20,23,25 346:5,15 369:12,18 370:1 country 303:16,20 348:7 349:6,22 351:11 county 254:18 303:16,20 depositions 359:22

352:1 353:9,13,20 356:19

dataset 265:20 345:7 349:21

datasets 342:18,20 343:4,7

360:13 362:3,8 364:23

databases 345:3

350:1

**derive** 302:14

describe 326:16

describes 302:9

designed 364:6

designing 291:5

descriptive 284:4

**detail** 314:19 318:18 358:7 determination 330:9 **determine** 303:19 310:1 **determined** 321:6 357:9 **determining** 301:7 303:1 315:15 **develop** 291:13 293:20 **developed** 295:20 306:4 **development** 288:15 324:13 devoid 350:18 Dicks 283:20 284:8 285:1 286:8,21 287:11,13,16,24 289:16 291:12,25 292:20 293:11,25 294:7,9,10,11 295:1,23 297:24 300:4 304:9 305:3 307:15 314:17 339:13 342:12,24 346:25 351:21 352:5 355:19 358:4 359:3 360:6,16 361:21,24 362:13 **diesel** 341:14 differ 268:17 difference 264:7 337:24 340:11 differences 278:6 **different** 266:3 268:9 275:10 282:10 288:20,22 290:15,19 350:20 360:25 362:6,7,7 **difficult** 276:16 difficulty 283:16 diminish 275:5,6 direct 256:5 257:25 308:7 directly 322:12 324:10 **disagree** 348:12,19 disagreement 303:4 discuss 300:3 discussed 289:19,23 314:16 discussing 280:8 discussion 266:15 289:13 292:19 300:17,23 358:20 dismiss 300:19 **dispute** 301:21 distance 334:18 341:16 distinguish 285:20 distributed 298:22

**distribution** 263:10 298:20 356:17 **DISTRICT** 254:1,2 **divided** 351:2 document 282:5,7 283:15 285:17 286:10,15,19 287:6 287:10,11,12,16 290:8 **documented** 274:16,20 documents 286:4 287:8,14,19 doing 261:5 283:16 284:11 289:25 293:11 337:17 338:10 342:1 361:25 362:2 362:4 364:11 dollars 338:9 **double** 266:18 356:12 doubt 298:24 299:1 Dr 257:4 258:2 260:7 266:17 272:2,10 273:25 280:11 283:4,23 284:8 285:1 286:7 286:21 287:5,13,16,23 288:16 289:14,16,21 291:3 291:12,25 292:7,22 293:5 293:11,25 294:2,2,7,7,9,9 294:10,15,15,21 295:3,12 295:23,23 297:23 300:3,4 304:6 305:2 307:15 314:17 315:25 316:8,9 318:20 320:25 322:24 323:11,16,22 324:25 325:4 326:19 328:8 328:10,16,18 330:14 331:22 337:5 341:5,20 342:3,24 343:6,23 344:4,18 346:5 347:5,10 348:6 349:4,23 350:11 351:21 352:1 357:8 358:2,4,15,23 359:16 360:3 361:20,24 362:2,9 363:12 364:17 365:13 366:1 367:12 367:19 draft 281:11 285:13 286:8 287:25 288:3 291:24 341:24 342:11 drafts 281:16,20 dramatically 263:22 draw 263:14 310:19 drawn 269:18

**DREW** 254:4 **drop** 316:13 drops 312:10 319:10 328:9 328:24 dry 276:23 due 365:6 duly 254:20 257:22 369:9 **dynamic** 276:15 dynamics 285:15  $\mathbf{E}$ **E** 255:1,1 256:1,3,3 288:18 288:20 290:10 342:4 359:2 359:12 360:5 369:1,1 earlier 276:3 286:9,22 323:7 330:25 360:22 early 312:17 East 276:25 **Eco** 308:4 ecological 274:16,21 economic 284:11 286:2 289:15 291:13 293:13,22 297:15 300:16 301:6 308:21 335:18 337:3,17,20 338:8 338:15,22,24 339:8,25 340:9,13 360:23 361:15 362:1,25 economics 291:16 297:18 **economist** 300:18 341:10 economists 285:14 291:14 300:14 323:4 edit 281:18 **edited** 281:17 EDMONDSON 254:4 effect 266:5 358:16 effective 318:11 **efficiency** 330:4 332:6 **effort** 264:15 either 261:10,17,24 263:12 263:17 271:18 279:2,17,19 283:3,5 291:7 305:25 314:17 323:4 329:25 332:18 332:24 345:15 362:15

366:19 369:20

elevated 365:6

Page 148 of 166

**embedded** 289:12 316:5,7 317:4 321:21 326:24 327:2 335:25 355:11 **embrace** 263:11 **estimating** 310:7 311:25 356:16 **empirical** 265:15 325:1 316:3 321:7 340:14,14 expected 271:7 277:11,12 employees 367:4 362:10,14 experience 282:3 employment 365:15 **estimation** 308:4 311:3,4 **expert** 275:12,19 280:17 **enable** 301:17 302:2 335:8 336:13 360:10 283:11 285:12 287:20 294:1 **ended** 349:9 et 254:11 279:5 305:18,24 319:12 **endorse** 323:22 **Eucha-Spavinaw** 343:8 expertise 291:16 293:19 **endorsed** 339:12 evaluate 364:7 364:18,24 evaluated 296:15 ensure 330:9 332:5,15 333:22 experts 283:4,22 307:16 334:2 347:20 363:21 evaluation 259:13 262:14 359:23 ensures 328:3 335:18,19 337:1,23 339:23 **Expires** 368:23 340:7,9 360:24 361:15 **explain** 271:4 277:7 288:18 **enterprises** 335:14 336:11 entire 314:13,14 332:5,10 362:1,3,25 363:9 364:12 313:23 320:21 352:22 339:14 343:1 351:2 event 369:21 **export** 319:1 **environment** 254:6 358:3,9 events 282:16 283:18,19 **exportation** 305:19 318:10 358:11,15,21 359:9 evidently 343:17 express 261:9,16 **environmental** 264:16 265:2 exactly 260:6 266:13 299:15 expressed 340:21 265:10 267:4,11 268:14 **Examination** 256:5 257:25 expressing 363:18 273:9,14 303:25 364:19 examining 292:22 Extension 347:19 365:2 **example** 263:20 276:10 extension-type 366:18,22 environments 276:24 exceeded 268:21 **extent** 261:10,17 311:22 equal 350:12 exceeding 349:11 357:1 363:2 **equates** 269:19 excess 258:25 343:21 353:14 **extra** 287:2 equation 313:1 353:21 354:15,17 extracted 342:11 erroneous 350:13 excessive 267:16,18 356:2 extrapolate 309:8 exclude 294:9 312:21 error 350:4,5 extrapolation 309:20 **errors** 343:5 extrapolations 307:2 310:5 excrement 355:10 **essential** 307:11 excuse 286:5 287:11 290:18 **extremely** 350:24,25 E-mail 294:20 essentially 281:11 319:1 322:18 332:16 360:10 establish 264:16 **exempt** 359:6 **e.g** 310:10 **established** 265:2 305:10 **exercise** 338:3,6  $\mathbf{F}$ exhibit 258:5 280:5 287:6,15 333:2,20 348:16 **F** 369:1 **estimate** 258:16 259:15 288:17,19,23 289:5,24 fact 278:3 292:20 309:11 290:13,15,17,18 291:24 284:23,24 285:4 295:21 336:2 296:21 297:5 298:16 303:2 293:5,7 341:21,23 342:8 factor 268:3 302:10 315:15 305:14 306:3,25 312:18 355:4,20 359:4 361:2 factors 259:12 264:1 320:8 exhibits 287:23 288:11 293:3 314:10,25 317:1 320:4 failure 350:16 358:16 321:15 322:5 327:15 328:6 exist 262:8 fair 291:17,17,18,20,21 336:9 328:12 329:23 330:8,13 existed 272:7 339:3 352:8 353:4 356:22 336:19,22 337:6 338:1 existence 302:1 **fairly** 346:14 exists 272:3 301:17 302:1 361:4 **false** 349:1 **estimated** 316:12 323:25 expect 266:9 271:18,24 familiar 289:2 342:7 324:6 331:25 335:1 272:11 273:18 274:3 275:6 **far** 286:13 292:22 294:13 277:5 299:2,10 300:1 estimates 285:2 305:16,18

314:21 341:6,12 345:15 347:10 **farm** 258:15 259:5 284:3 289:16 363:17,20 **farmer** 260:17.22 farmers 345:10 366:11,15,23 **farming** 284:5 289:13 Farms 255:10 257:13 **Favetteville** 255:15 366:21 **fed** 366:6 **feed** 327:5 feedback 281:20 **feeding** 322:11,13 327:10 **feel** 273:7 **fertilizable** 296:10 301:8 324:2 327:9,17 330:20 332:22 335:10 **fertilizer** 284:20 328:20,20 329:4,19,24 330:22 350:8 366:5 **fescue** 325:24 fewer 278:8.15 **field** 258:15,22 259:5,8,24,24 259:25 260:5,10,13,13,23 260:23 261:2 271:9 272:7 276:19 324:11 325:10 326:7 328:4,22 330:4,10 332:5,10 341:5 344:14 347:6,16,21 360:12 361:12 364:8,10,15 **fields** 258:17 259:24 260:3,9 260:12,15,25 265:4 322:10 322:12,14 324:10 325:23 327:9 328:19 346:6,9,14 **fifth** 275:15 **fifty-one** 312:11 **figure** 268:7,16,17,17,19 271:4 277:18,20 278:4,5 279:6 296:11 311:6 318:4 318:19 320:18 325:5 332:8 351:20 352:6 353:14,15,21 354:6,20,23 **figures** 267:13 **filing** 328:13 **fill** 307:5 308:10,18 311:15 315:7,22

**final** 287:24 288:3 290:14 292:1 342:4,11 348:13 358:2 **find** 276:6 301:14 308:7,10 364:14 **finding** 345:8 **fine** 311:3 335:19 337:21,25 361:16 first 257:22 281:10,10,11 282:3 286:16 287:5 288:19 288:23 289:5,24 290:23 296:23 297:2 329:5 330:23 342:17 348:14 352:8 355:24 369:9 **firsthand** 321:17 **Fisher** 316:8 **fit** 267:15,22 **five** 356:7 **five-county** 309:22 312:1,2 313:15,21 314:11 315:15 356:6 **five-year** 303:12 fix 287:17 **flat** 299:24 300:20 flaw 351:18 **flip** 290:1 **follow** 314:8 360:25 following 292:13 302:16 331:17 365:21 **follows** 257:24 FOODS 254:11 **footnote** 312:10,14 316:13,23 316:24,24 317:7 318:4 319:10,20 326:10,13,14 328:9,24 329:2,12,13,13 footnotes 355:22 forage 266:22 277:15 289:23 295:21 297:7 320:10,16,23 323:25 324:5,9,14,17 325:23 326:7,19 327:4 330:21 331:24 332:23 333:8 333:15 337:7 338:14 340:17 361:5 **forages** 284:20

forage-producing 296:10

301:8 335:11 356:5 **foregoing** 368:4 369:16 **form** 259:2 261:3,7,14,21 262:2 263:2,8 272:14,19 273:22 277:7 285:13 287:9 289:12,19 291:10 292:1 299:20 304:23 307:10,21 311:1,9 323:6,14,19 325:16 335:5 337:13 339:16 340:5 340:20 341:24 344:6 345:17 346:8,17 347:12 352:14 353:7 355:9,21 357:16 358:18 359:12,17 360:20 361:22 363:7 364:22 365:4 369:14 **format** 281:8,13 formulate 293:15 **forward** 340:11 **found** 279:8,9 341:13,15 364:25 four 343:7 354:24 **frame** 276:17 Frank 254:15 256:4 257:4,21 367:22 368:3,12 370:1 **frequent** 291:15 front 258:5 291:4 293:8 **full** 311:22 355:24 369:17 fundamental 263:25 **further** 366:2 369:16,19 **future** 276:13 G

**G** 256:3 gathered 352:1 356:19 gathering 344:13 general 254:5 281:22 283:25 284:25 297:14 305:13 320:6 326:3,5 338:13,15,17 345:25 generalities 337:19 generalization 293:16 generalizations 300:15 generalize 301:4 generally 272:25 generate 285:1

**generated** 266:8 285:5,6 303:20 331:3 341:7 **generation** 318:1 337:7 340:15,17 361:4 generic 299:22 George 282:17 George's 255:14 257:14 343:14 **getting** 339:17 347:24,25 353:22,24 364:15 **gist** 284:16 give 262:14 289:8 290:4 326:5 349:1 given 290:25 297:13 306:6 316:12 322:3 330:8 **gives** 330:6 giving 350:11 359:21 gleaned 284:7 350:1 **go** 259:17 270:2 273:6 287:3 288:9,11 292:18 296:18 301:14 304:6,7 307:25 313:3 317:3.19 327:13 335:7 340:11 343:4 345:23 352:19,20 360:1 goal 277:12 311:5 337:25 363:15 goals 362:7 363:21 goes 264:21 311:13 326:11 347:10 352:20 going 259:12 260:23 266:19 274:25 277:13,15,16 284:14 285:24 288:9,11 289:4 290:2 292:22 295:1,15 301:21 304:19,21 306:12,14 308:16 310:3 311:5 314:24 323:9 336:25 339:5 349:22 351:11,13 354:20 356:9 359:6,14,21,25 360:24 361:1 362:25 363:8 **good** 258:2,3 268:2 286:1 308:21 321:4 340:22 Gordon 342:20 363:12 **grain** 366:5 grammatical 288:5 **graph** 315:7 352:5,9,17

graphs 311:20 grass 277:15 363:14 graze 326:8 327:4 **grazed** 326:1 **grazing** 327:11 **greater** 265:25 greatest 354:9 gross 311:4 grossly 301:4 351:4 **group** 260:11 **grow** 277:15 326:6 **growers** 366:23 **growth** 266:23 277:13 314:6 325:25 guess 258:9 262:4 278:8 294:1 295:4,6 296:19 297:1 301:21 307:4 308:19 310:3 334:16,21 345:11 350:14 358:7

#### Η

hair 353:1 half 267:25 268:3,5 278:18 354:16 359:19 hand 286:6 287:5 288:16 307:9 368:8 369:22 **handled** 298:3 hands 308:24 Hang 320:19 happen 265:16,17 350:23 happens 342:3 hard 361:23.24 harder 361:20 harvest 271:9 326:7 **harvested** 271:7,8,8 hash 352:24 353:11,16 hay 320:11 321:5,7,15,15 322:3,7,10,14 323:12 324:1 324:6 326:8 338:14 356:6 **headed** 302:23 heading 311:24 343:5 346:25 348:14 358:3 heads 367:15

hearing 265:22 279:10 280:9

367:24

heavy 276:25 **height** 354:4 held 266:15 314:12 help 279:6 281:18 287:17 294:2 302:6 **helping** 357:19 **hesitating** 270:20 308:19 **high** 264:23 270:24 271:15 272:4,9 278:15,19 349:16 350:24,25 **higher** 259:20,21 260:1 266:7 266:9 highlighted 288:9 Hill 255:6 257:16,16 hilly 299:24 hired 307:25 308:1 historical 291:1 297:7 298:7 303:3 **historically** 302:24 307:24 **history** 297:10 360:13 hold 289:7 **holding** 273:1 hope 270:17 hopefully 274:8 horse 339:17 hosted 282:4 hours 359:18.19 **hundred** 259:20 312:11 I

idea 307:22 322:25 355:6 identify 257:6 279:3 **ignore** 279:2,19 II 254:14 257:4 370:2 **Illinois** 261:6,13,19 263:16 269:4,15 272:12 273:18 274:4 275:5,8,14 277:2 298:23 299:6 301:2 319:1,5 321:2 322:20 323:13 329:3 335:23 341:18 365:9 **imagine** 366:20 **impact** 274:16,21,22,25 implementation 363:17 implemented 358:6 **implicated** 292:24 365:7,10

Page 151 of 166

**import** 318:25 importance 274:9 **important** 274:17 329:8 **imported** 319:4 **impression** 288:4,6 349:1 **improper** 347:1 359:18 **improve** 272:12 **improved** 261:19 365:15 improvement 261:25 inappropriate 275:12 inch 347:21 include 307:2 312:23 316:7 included 293:1 305:1,20 349:15 includes 268:13 277:20 **including** 312:9,11 324:23 incomplete 308:6 incorporate 262:11 increase 271:19 272:1 298:9 314:2 326:20,25 333:4 increased 313:22 independent 305:21 independently 352:7 index 258:12,20 259:6,7,13 259:18,24,25 260:8,19 261:12,18 262:19 263:1,9 264:1,6,21 265:6 267:7,10 267:15,19 268:20 269:22 270:9 272:2 363:23 364:2,4 364:5,6,12 365:15 **indicate** 336:14 352:17 **indicated** 352:20 355:22 **indication** 308:9,14,15 **indices** 262:1,6,9 280:6 individual 283:21 288:5 351:16 individuals 337:16 industrial 274:13 industry 305:10 308:7 **information** 275:24 276:12 293:1 312:15 323:16 326:17 338:8 357:13 **initial** 290:21 **injunction** 279:10 280:9 **injury** 364:3

**inputs** 272:4 **inserted** 333:13 instances 281:19 insubstantial 333:16 integrator 344:9 integrators 343:14 interested 274:10,12 369:21 interpolate 308:22 **interpolating** 308:18 311:14 interpolation 310:11,15 interpolations 314:5 **interpret** 299:23 316:18 324:15 **interpretation** 280:1 299:22 309:25 311:18 313:2 **interpreted** 259:21 361:24 362:2 interpreting 324:4 **inventory** 309:22 312:2 315:14,16,23 316:11 involved 291:4,7 350:5,17 IRW 284:1 293:14 295:22 296:11.22 297:10 300:8 303:2,3 309:23 315:13 316:6 322:9 328:12 330:21 333:8 335:10,14 336:11 337:11,18 356:1 358:6 360:11 361:8 362:11,15 363:14 366:12 issue 292:24 333:16 **i.e** 258:13 J

Jackson 255:19
January 254:18 257:5 369:23
job 304:19 307:9
John 282:25
Johnson 343:6,24 344:4,18
 346:5 347:5,10 349:4,24
 350:11 351:22 352:1 358:4
 361:20 362:2,9
Johnson's 330:15 342:20,25
 348:6 358:15,23 363:12
joint 294:25

**Jones** 283:2

Jorgensen 282:14,15 judgments 293:17 justified 363:12

**K** 255:14 257:14

#### K

keep 271:11,13 331:14 kilogram 268:22 277:22 278:9 329:14,22,22 kind 284:21,25 295:14,16 297:15,16 344:3,4,14,24 345:9 346:6 **know** 261:4,23 263:24 267:5 267:6 272:20 274:18,23,24 276:6 277:3 280:23 281:23 282:9.21.22.22 284:2.21 285:24 287:10 288:2 290:21 293:25 294:4,16 295:22 296:3,5,13,16 297:23 298:1 298:3,24 299:15 303:23 304:24 305:2 306:2 307:19 307:23 308:12,19,25 309:14 309:17 310:1 312:3,5,10,21 313:6,17 314:13 315:4,25 316:14,16 318:23,25 319:4 319:6,12,16,25 320:16 321:11,25 322:19 323:2,11 323:15,20 325:3,4,6,9 326:2 326:12,17 327:18 328:14 329:5,8 330:23 331:3,3 332:1,7,18,20,23 335:16,20 338:10 339:24 344:8 345:18 345:24 349:3,8,14,20 351:3 351:14 355:3 356:21 357:1 357:6,7,7 367:6 **knowing** 274:9 279:25 355:15 **knowledge** 262:3 263:19 295:5 305:21 315:5 321:18 322:22 323:9 349:10 364:18 known 283:9

## L

L 261:2

knows 323:4

**lab** 267:20,22 344:14 346:2 346:19,23 **labeled** 286:4 laboratory 350:4 **lacking** 302:13 land 259:4 269:10 273:17 297:10 298:3 299:13,14,15 299:18,23,24,24,25 300:1 302:10 306:4 316:6,12 318:10,11 319:8 333:6 334:1,10 337:11 343:13 346:4 351:2,14 361:8 landscape 263:4,7,10,21,24 264:4 274:15,18 351:8 large 263:24 345:3 larger 351:14 **launch** 292:7 Law 255:4,7,11,14,17 laws 254:21 **lawsuit** 367:5 lawyer 280:12,13 281:18 283:12 lawyers 282:12,14 lay 338:24 lavers 312:20 leave 326:8 **leaves** 327:7 **leaving** 364:15 led 322:22 **left** 326:25 334:4 355:4,19 legal 265:7 legitimate 315:8 let's 258:8 268:7,16 270:2 273:13 277:18 289:21 290:1 293:5 296:18 298:19 309:12 316:23 317:10 331:13 340:1 340:11 342:15 343:4 350:21 351:19 360:2,3 365:18 **level** 265:4,20 266:7 273:13 274:2,25 275:2 278:14 293:10 297:9 308:20 314:18 322:3 328:1 332:4,5 338:22 347:23 348:15,16 350:23,24 351:1 levels 261:13 274:1,4 278:7

290:25 334:25 365:6 **light** 288:14 **lighter** 361:25 **limit** 264:12,18,24 265:1,17 265:18,23 266:6,18 267:1 267:11 269:6,7 326:1 347:8 347:13 348:3 353:12 limitation 269:18 limited 269:3 271:2 277:6 348:3 limits 264:10 limnologist 273:5 **line** 266:11 281:6,7 370:3 **linear** 310:11,14,20,21 314:5 **linearly** 311:14 **Lisa** 254:19 367:20 368:5 369:6.24 list 355:2 listening 318:20 **literal** 293:6 Literature 291:2 **litter** 259:7 260:18,23 261:2 269:25 270:7 271:14,19,25 291:1 296:22 297:10 298:20 298:22 302:24 303:3 305:15 305:19 306:4,6,8,11,16,23 306:23,25 309:23 310:2 316:4,5,10,12,19,25 317:1,5 317:24 318:9,12 319:4,8,9 319:21,23 320:8,13,15 321:1,7,20 325:14,14,17 328:7,20,22,23 329:1 332:17 333:2,4,6,7,14,21,24 333:25 334:8,9,12,16 335:9 335:11,22 336:6 337:7,9,10 338:11 340:14,14,17 341:6 341:12 343:13,21 356:1,4 356:10,17,20,24 358:5,9 361:4,6,7 363:14 364:20 365:3 366:1,2 little 270:3 288:12 290:15 296:2 297:1 320:19 live 322:24 lives 323:1 **livestock** 300:6,7

load 258:13 **loafing** 350:23 **located** 313:5,16 logic 285:8 291:21 **long** 281:12 340:10 look 258:8 260:23 268:7,16 277:18 284:3 288:23 289:2 289:9 290:4 307:12 308:3 318:1 339:1 342:5,15 343:4 343:9,14 344:1,5,7,15 345:3 345:5 351:19 358:9 360:2,3 looked 279:7 281:20 286:13 287:8,16 288:20,24 292:3,5 295:24 296:7 305:24 318:3 341:9,11,24 343:24 344:4,8 344:18 346:6 348:6 355:19 367:8 **looking** 260:25 270:16 278:24 293:5 302:12 314:1 339:14 347:18 looks 286:20 288:22 290:6,13 301:5 311:11 315:3 loss 258:17,24 259:3,16,22 losses 279:4 280:7 lot 280:24 305:7 306:12,16 326:6 335:6 336:19 338:25 349:22 361:20 lots 322:12,13 **low** 267:16,17 270:3,8 271:18 278:4 351:7 lower 275:20,20 278:14

#### $\mathbf{M}$

M 261:2 Maguire 279:5,7,12,17 Maguire's 279:22 mail 294:21 main 313:4 major 302:22 majority 353:5,9 making 276:9 man 317:25 manage 306:14 managed 259:4 management 276:10,12,18

327:11 345:9 346:3,9,12,15 346:21 360:13 363:17,20 **managing** 306:17 mark 287:3 352:24 353:11,16 marked 287:6.15 288:16 292:20 342:7 **marking** 341:20 Maryland 262:9,20 263:1 264:10,20 267:9,10,14 268:11 269:24 270:8 273:15 274:3 315:10 341:10 344:5 344:15 materially 288:3 math 271:22,23 314:1 318:15 318:17 320:19 322:8 331:11 332:20 mathematical 302:15 matter 289:6 294:22 308:13 matters 362:22 **McDaniel** 255:10 257:12,12 259:2 261:3,7,14,21 262:2 263:2,8 271:20 272:14 273:3.21 274:6 275:9.22 281:3,8 282:9 286:3,16 287:2 288:4 289:7,11 292:25 294:6 295:7,10 298:13 299:19 304:23 307:10,21 311:1,9 317:15 323:6,14,19 325:16 327:20 333:9,12,16 334:4,6 335:5 337:13 339:16 340:5,20 344:6 345:17 346:8,10,17 347:12 352:14,18 353:7 355:9,21 357:16 358:18 359:11,24 360:20 361:22 363:7 364:22 365:4 367:14 367:19 mean 259:16 282:1 287:10 294:11 299:23,23 302:7 309:24 311:19 315:18 317:2 324:3,13 334:3,24 336:17 339:13,18 354:7,11,14 meaning 350:20 means 267:1 299:16 302:8,11 309:17 312:22 313:19,24

321:24 324:4 325:10,13 326:2,3 334:13,19,23 348:23 351:13 meant 260:10 287:12 300:1 326:16 measure 302:15 310:19 336:15 median 301:7,9 336:15 354:6 354:12,13,13,15 **medium** 267:16,17 268:6 270:13,16 271:18 278:9 meet 356:2 memory 341:13 **mental** 284:5 mentioned 285:11 304:18 342:14 mentions 294:1 mess 294:13 message 281:24,24 method 297:14 298:11 308:17 310:12 339:12 methodology 291:5,9,12 292:5 293:20,23 296:15,19 297:12 337:5,21,22 339:6 340:13 360:18,21 361:3,16 362:19 363:1 **methods** 321:6.20 middle 258:8,10 291:7 350:15 354:10 midpoint 307:14 330:16 Mike 283:20 miles 254:6 341:16 milk 303:18 milligrams 268:22 277:21 278:9 329:13,21,22 million 268:1 312:11 313:5 313:16 319:14 321:17 322:6 329:7 333:5,7,13 356:4 mind 297:2 320:3 366:8 mine 288:9 **minimum** 330:3 minus 330:2 minute 287:1 355:7 **mirrors** 311:6 misleading 351:18 352:15

353:8 misread 327:21 333:9 missing 307:3 310:8,10,12,17 310:22,23,24 314:11 **misspoke** 327:22 **mistake** 361:13 model 308:21 **modified** 337:14 modify 337:12 moment 293:9 317:10 354:19 morning 258:2,3 286:3 move 322:12 341:16 moved 274:14,18 movement 364:7 **moving** 331:14 **multiple** 258:17 260:9,12 281:6 multiplied 306:6

#### $\mathbf{N}$

N 255:1 256:1,3 name 283:1,3 294:18 named 357:23 369:9 names 283:8.21 Nance 255:3 256:5 257:8,8 258:1 275:18 286:25 288:2 289:10 292:18 295:8 317:14 317:17 331:13 333:11.17 334:5 365:18 National 303:7,13 308:4 321:12 nationwide 262:7 NATURAL 254:7 near 266:11 325:15,18 necessarily 335:16 necessary 270:10 363:20 need 259:8 264:6 274:17,21 276:6 277:8,16 291:15 292:8 304:20 309:3,4,6,14 309:20,25 310:1 311:7 317:13 329:5 330:1 331:6 337:18 345:23 347:7,15 356:20 needed 259:1 293:14 308:20 308:23 322:6 332:11 339:19

340:23 357:12 needs 356:2,3 negative 349:5,7,8 352:13,17 negligent 279:5,12,18,21 280:11 net 305:19 never 284:6 286:2 314:18 320:3 328:21 338:9 Nevertheless 337:4 new 288:14 nine 312:11 **nitrogen** 270:11,22 274:12 276:4,7,14,17,20 277:8,11 277:16 nitrogen-based 270:12,18 non-statistician 302:6 **normal** 327:10 North 255:15 NORTHERN 254:2 **Notary** 368:21 **notes** 369:12 **notice** 278:8 342:2 **noticed** 359:18 **number** 285:6 303:9 304:4 306:18,21,22 307:3 309:21 310:2,7,13,19 311:25 312:3 312:18 314:10 315:12,16,19 316:16 319:12,13 324:18 327:19,22 330:14,18,24 331:1,2 332:2 348:14 350:9 350:10 351:3,15 356:19 363:10 370:3 **numbered** 254:17 286:17 342:15 368:6 numbers 285:1 296:16 300:21 304:9,12,16 305:22 306:1 308:17 313:17,25 315:17,23 332:19,21,24 350:1 351:12 numerical 259:19 numerous 263:12 **nutrient** 269:3 274:9 337:7 340:17 345:9 348:3 361:5 nutrients 357:11

# 0

O 255:18 object 259:2 261:3,7,14,21 262:2 263:2.8 272:14 273:3 273:21 289:11,17,19 299:19 304:23 307:10,21 311:1,9 323:6,14,19 325:16 335:5 337:13 339:16 340:5,20 344:6 345:17 346:8,17 347:12 352:14 353:7 355:9 355:21 357:16 358:18 359:11,11,17 360:20 361:22 363:7 364:22 365:4 **objection** 274:6 346:10 352:18 **objections** 359:15,20,22 objective 258:12 objectives 362:6 **observation** 277:5 350:12 354:3 **observations** 325:1 353:24 354:5,8,12 obtain 328:6 331:24 **obtained** 298:8 315:13,19 **obvious** 353:25 occurs 258:24 356:25 357:2 odd 312:11 offer 289:4,18 offered 272:15 273:23 291:10 357:20 offering 289:22 291:8 **Offhand** 314:15 **Oh** 285:23 320:22 **OK** 255:5,8,12 okay 258:7,20,24 259:6 260:7 260:17 261:5,16 262:15,17 263:11 264:9,15 265:7,10 266:14 267:1,3,9,17,21 269:3,14 270:2,24 272:2,10 273:5,16 274:23 275:2,4 276:3 277:18 278:2 279:24 280:3,8,11 282:1 283:13 284:8 285:20 286:9,15

289:3 290:9,17,23 291:3

292:4,10 293:9,22 294:5,17 294:24 295:2,3 296:1,5,9,18 296:20,25 297:17,20,23 298:3,6 299:9,12,17 300:6 300:10.25 301:14.20 302:6 303:7 304:3,13,19 305:2,6 305:12 306:19,22 307:15 308:13,16 309:7,13,18 310:3,6 311:11,19 313:3,3 313:13 314:16 315:6,12,25 316:16,20,23 318:8 319:7 319:20 320:3 321:14,25 322:3,9 323:3,11,16,25 324:18,20 325:22 326:19 327:3,15 328:18 329:17 330:20 331:5,9,12 332:15 332:22 334:6,13,15,21 336:13 339:6 342:6,12,13 342:21,24 343:3,11,17 344:3,24 345:14,19 346:5 346:13 347:4,10,17 348:6 348:22 349:11,13 350:3,11 351:19 352:8,12,16 353:1,3 353:11,16,19 354:6,15 355:12,18,24 356:14,22 357:1 358:2,13,22 360:8,9 361:1 362:5 364:4,6 366:14 367:3 **Oklahoma** 254:2,5,6,8,19,22 257:9,11 261:10,18 262:8 263:7,12 264:11,16,18 267:24 269:1,16 273:1 303:9 304:14 309:9,16 310:14 311:11,16 312:20 313:6,16 323:1 327:25 343:18,23 345:15 347:8,11 347:13 348:2 354:24 366:15 366:19 369:3,8 **Oklahoman** 268:24 277:24 **Olsen** 328:8,18 Olsen's 328:10,16,24

**omitted** 355:23

356:8

once 293:10 306:3 319:11

ones 287:13 293:18 350:13

Page 155 of 166

**online** 304:7 on-the-ground 284:4 **opening** 321:19 operation 284:4 operator 356:24 **opine** 261:24 336:10 opining 289:17 293:22 296:12 **opinion** 261:9,16 272:17,19 273:22 275:19 285:7,18 289:18 305:21 363:18 opinions 272:15 275:13 291:8 **optimum** 267:16,18 order 314:10 **original** 277:20 originally 341:24 **OSU** 347:19 **OSU's** 330:9 ought 343:3 outcome 259:10,18,21 318:5 outlined 295:20 296:6 298:16 337:6 338:4 361:3 outline-type 281:13 **output** 321:5,7 323:25 outside 272:15 273:4 274:7 291:16 358:19 overall 260:18 262:14 overarching 278:6 overseeded 326:1 overwhelming 353:5 owner 356:24 P **P** 255:1,1,18 256:3 258:12,16

P 255:1,1,18 256:3 258:12,16 258:20,24 259:3,16 264:1 264:23 265:21 266:1,3,4,5,8 266:9 268:21 274:4 278:7 279:4 284:19 337:7,8,8 338:13 347:23 348:15 351:1 360:10 361:5,5,6 362:11,14 363:23 364:2,4 page 255:3 256:6 257:10,10 258:5,10 262:5 268:7,16 277:18 278:24 287:20 290:1 290:10 293:6 309:19 321:5

330:1 331:22 342:15,16 346:25 349:3 350:15 351:19 355:24 358:2 359:14 368:1 370:3 pages 288:19,23,24 289:5,24 342:15 369:17 **paid** 283:10 paper 357:23 366:24 paragraph 258:11 262:4,18 278:25,25 281:12,13 290:9 306:3 327:25 331:22 337:4 348:14 355:24 358:14 359:1 360:2,4,6 paragraphs 287:20 310:4 parameters 272:22 291:1 paraphrasing 262:7 parenthesis 297:7,9 312:8 325:24,24,25 326:1 **parenthetical** 312:8 334:23 part 290:17 294:25 302:22 304:14,17 305:12 313:4 314:3 338:3.10 341:22 342:4 358:10.25 359:12 participating 284:9 participation 294:9 particular 258:15,21 259:17 260:5 262:23 291:5 296:5 310:10 352:9 particularly 346:16 particulars 296:1 **parties** 369:20 parts 267:25 329:6 pasture 320:10 323:25 324:2 324:9 335:24 350:23 356:6 356:9,23 **pastureland** 337:10 361:7 pasturelands 327:17 **pastures** 363:14 pathway 325:21 patterns 277:4 **people** 282:10 291:15 294:17 307:25,25 308:5 344:25 345:4 346:14 362:6 **percent** 270:1,4,14,25 271:15 271:17,20,21,24 278:12,15

278:16,22 313:5,16,22,23 315:1 320:10,23,23 324:12 324:14,16,21 325:5 327:6 328:2 330:3 332:6 333:25 334:1,9,11,18,21 351:2 percentage 269:23 278:4 320:22 **perform** 263:4 **performed** 324:25 343:20 performing 288:25 **period** 314:13,14,20 315:17 319:10 321:16,16 322:5 324:1 327:17 331:25 343:20 **periods** 327:5 permissible 267:9 permitted 269:20 **person** 260:17 personal 323:9 personally 298:24 328:14 perspective 284:13 pertinent 293:18 304:22,25 **per-acre** 324:7 333:4 **per-bird** 318:1 **Peterson** 255:10 257:12 367:14 **phase** 270:15 phases 274:23,24 **PhD** 254:15 256:4 257:21 275:2 368:3,12 370:1 **phone** 255:19 257:18 367:16 **phosphorus** 258:14,21,25 259:5,6,7,8,12,18,22 260:8 260:19 261:11,18 262:1,6,9 262:12,19 263:1 264:21 265:3,5 266:20,20 267:4,7 267:10,14,19 268:20 269:8 269:9,21,22 271:2,5,6,9,12 272:2 274:12 275:7,21 276:11,11 277:21 278:2 280:6,7 285:15 296:22 297:6,8 298:8,9 303:1 306:5 306:7,11,13,16 320:5,7,9,12 320:17 321:1 322:4,6,14 324:11,12,14,17,21 325:11 325:14,23 327:7,8,16 328:1

Page 156 of 166

330:11,22 331:23 334:25 population 314:2 339:18 367:1 368:4 portion 293:7 324:10 335:12 336:6,7 340:18 presumably 263:6 314:1 position 319:18 323:21 325:7 **presume** 322:22 324:7 332:9 346:16 347:7,15 356:3 363:24 364:3,5,6,7,12,15,21 336:10 346:11 365:3,6,15 possibilities 350:9 presumption 299:25 phosphorus-based 270:19,23 possibility 348:25 **pretty** 286:1 preventing 279:24 271:3 possible 365:8 **physical** 263:19 264:3 311:7 potential 365:10 previous 313:11 prices 341:14 336:20,23 339:1 **poultry** 289:16,22 296:22 297:10,24 298:22 304:24 physically 309:5 principally 343:21 **principles** 262:6,8,10 **PI** 268:9 305:3 306:3,23 309:9,15 picture 284:5 319:21 320:8,13 321:1 **print** 310:7 **piece** 346:4 325:14 328:7,22,23 329:1 prior 318:12 328:6 329:1 place 263:20 308:5 369:18 333:24 334:8 337:6,9,10 probability 272:9 **placed** 275:14 340:14,17 343:12,12 355:25 **probably** 277:16 282:22 292:8 301:5 307:12 308:3 **plainly** 350:13 361:4,6,7 363:13 364:20 **plaintiff** 254:9,16 305:25 321:3 330:19 361:13,17 365:3,7 366:1,2,6,11,15 **pound** 264:17 347:14 328:8 **problem** 275:25 340:1,3 351:10 363:25 364:19,20 PLAINTIFFS 255:3 pounds 258:14 267:15,22,24 plaintiff's 295:20 296:6 268:25 269:18 277:16,25 365:2 305:16 316:8 319:12 341:21 297:5 298:7 306:5,7,11 problems 365:6 **plan** 276:18 345:9 360:9,12 317:12,22,24 320:5,17,24 procedure 360:25 360:14 362:23 328:1 329:6,10,17 330:11 **procedures** 284:14 298:15 planning 276:21 335:2 347:20 **proceed** 295:8 302:19 340:1 **planting** 276:17 powers 333:17 **proceedings** 292:14 331:18 Plaza 255:18 **practice** 322:9,20,23 326:16 365:22 368:6 327:3 348:21 359:21 363:15 process 285:7 301:11,12 please 257:6 258:5 290:4,5,21 295:14 317:20 326:15 **practices** 300:6,8 323:5 processes 284:14 351:20 352:22 362:17 335:13 336:11 358:5 **produce** 277:17 322:6 331:24 367:20 precipitation 277:4 **produced** 254:15 296:22 **plot** 310:18 302:24 303:2,3,9,20 305:15 **precise** 309:2,6 341:3 plotted 352:5 precisely 326:4 307:1,20,24 309:23 315:13 **precision** 308:20 311:7 point 266:11 271:11 294:6 315:16,20 316:4,10,19 Predict 280:6 300:22 307:9 309:1 310:23 318:13 319:23 320:11,17 prefacing 361:14 333:3,6,7 334:17 335:9,22 313:9 331:9 339:23 345:24 345:24 348:1 353:22 354:10 **preliminary** 279:10 280:9 357:11 **pointed** 273:24 **premise** 346:18 **producers** 343:12 346:1 **prepare** 280:23 366:11,15 points 307:14 310:12 321:22 330:10 332:12 353:9,13,20 **prepared** 280:17 287:23 producing 305:7 policy 265:3,12,13 288:13 293:2 303:25 331:9 **product** 294:13 policymakers 265:8 preparing 288:25 **production** 266:23 291:1 political 265:8 present 275:1 330:25 366:24 293:13 304:24 305:3 306:4 poop 355:8 presentation 366:23 308:3 309:9,15 312:19 poor 363:14 presentations 366:18 319:21,24 320:1 321:7,16 **poorly** 363:12 presented 275:11 293:12 321:21 322:3,10 324:5

330:21 334:25 337:18 338:14,14,15 356:1 productivity 277:12 **products** 303:17 **profession** 317:25 336:5 344:25 program 318:10,25 319:2 **project** 276:18 properties 336:21 **property** 336:24 proportion 351:8 proposition 325:2 **protection** 363:16,21 provide 258:16 298:16 301:9 **provided** 367:11 provides 332:6 proximity 322:11 **public** 308:3 368:21 **publication** 347:19 357:18 **publicly** 343:22 **pull** 304:7,8 **purpose** 263:5 286:1 297:14 301:6 337:16.16 339:8 340:6,8,13 346:7,23 purposes 263:15 264:20 308:20 321:4 330:17 335:17 335:19 337:20 338:1,4,5 340:21 345:4 361:15 362:1 362:16,20 **put** 261:1 269:9 288:11,19 354:24 355:3 putting 258:25 309:10 **P-based** 337:10 361:8 **p.m** 365:20,22,23,25 367:23 367:25

### O

quadruple 266:18 qualified 275:23 276:1 quality 261:19,25 272:11,21 272:23,25 273:1,19 275:12 363:16,18,21,25 364:20 365:2,5,16 quantified 355:13

quantifies 363:23

quantify 364:2
quantitative 258:13
question 260:21 263:15
273:25 275:11,23 276:1
289:8,14,17,20,21 317:20
329:21 330:5,6 342:18
345:19 349:11 354:19 360:1
362:17
questions 280:24 284:1,12,19
367:15,17,18
quick 279:14 290:6 365:18
quickly 295:8
quote 322:15,16

R R 255:1 369:1 rainfall 276:22,25 raise 294:6 297:6 320:6 330:12,23 331:6 332:11 334:12 **raised** 330:2 **raising** 366:2 ran 362:23 range 302:12 330:16 352:11 rank 354:8 **ranking** 354:10 rarely 318:1 rate 270:7,10,12,13,18,19,22 270:23 271:1,2,3,3,6 277:11 298:7 314:1 333:1 355:25 rates 284:20,20,21 ratings 260:19 ratio 310:1 315:12,19,22 316:25 Rausser 287:24 292:20 294:11,15,21 295:3,23 297:23 300:4 304:9 305:2 307:15 314:17 322:24 339:13 342:11,24 346:25 351:21 352:4 355:19 358:4 359:2 360:6,16 361:21,25 362:13 Rausser's 294:8,9 reach 320:9 328:4 332:4

333:21,25 334:10

reached 279:1 reaching 341:12 read 258:18 279:14 280:3 285:16,17 291:18 295:13 301:12 326:14 338:23 357:17 360:14 361:1 367:19 reading 278:10 288:17 291:23 313:19 334:7 350:3 readings 353:5 reads 290:25 316:25 ready 357:19 real 300:24,25 301:2 314:8 321:3 356:15,16 realistic 320:18 350:6,10 356:14 **realize** 319:11 **realized** 300:24 really 259:11 276:22 284:2 294:14 306:15 309:5,17 314:8 329:20 345:11 347:22 351:14 353:23 reask 289:21 reason 260:7,14 344:17 345:14,22,25 346:18 reasonable 284:22,23 285:5 285:22 298:10 299:6,18,20 306:10.21 317:25 318:5 320:20,25 322:5 324:18,19 328:6 329:3,18,23 330:13 330:17 341:16 recall 264:11,14 276:5 283:7 283:10,11 298:5 301:11 342:22 349:25 357:22 358:1 **receive** 269:24 received 328:19,21,23 **receives** 276:23 recess 292:13 331:17 365:21 **recessed** 367:24 recognize 283:1,3,8 286:6,18 331:2 **recognized** 264:10 283:12 recollection 283:25 290:20 recommendations 346:3 **record** 257:3,7 266:16 280:3 292:11,14,16,19 294:12

results 262:19 344:21 327:20 331:15,18,20 343:19 322:14 324:9,11,12 327:16 359:25 365:19,22,24 367:23 **renders** 358:17 **retained** 307:15 **records** 308:3 **repeat** 318:22 **return** 327:5 **reduce** 274:1 report 258:4 267:20 268:8 review 286:21 290:21 272:16 273:4 274:7 275:15 **reduced** 261:12 369:13 reviewed 286:8 290:10 293:1 reducing 315:1 276:4 277:19 280:23 283:5 359:2 **revised** 305:17 reductions 261:24 285:11,12 286:8,21 287:9 refer 287:19 287:17,20,24 288:17,25 ridiculous 339:2 reference 270:17 281:14 290:8,9,14 292:21 293:2 right 259:14 260:6,24 265:24 266:24 268:4,25 270:17 290:8 347:18 294:8,25 296:3 302:23 referenced 328:25 349:7 271:24 278:20,23 286:12 323:22 328:14 330:15 337:4 **referred** 288:18 310:16 340:12,19 342:12,14 348:6 287:15 289:7 290:11 291:23 349:15,19 358:8,10,19 294:14 295:5,5,12 297:21 referring 348:20 360:23 361:18 359:1,3,12 360:2,6 361:19 302:22,24 305:14 307:5 refers 317:7 326:6 363:6 310:3 311:24 313:8 314:20 **reflective** 297:9 335:13 **reported** 369:11 314:25 316:3 317:10 319:17 **reframe** 273:25 **Reporter** 254:20 369:7 320:14 326:10,23 330:8 regard 284:11 292:25 Reporter's 256:7 335:16 338:3,24 342:10 reports 280:17 287:25 305:24 regarding 351:12 343:5 344:11 348:4,24 regardless 259:3 343:11 349:18 351:8,22,24 353:2 **region** 276:25 represent 290:13 342:10 354:1,11 359:5,10 362:22 regs 265:14 344:19 346:14 363:22,25 366:8,10 regulators 357:8 **representative** 309:6 336:20 **rigor** 341:4 regulatory 264:15 358:3,9,11 **rigorous** 335:7 337:1,23 336:23 342:19,25 345:20 358:15,21 359:8 346:6 351:7 339:23 360:24 361:25 363:9 **related** 355:11 represented 309:11 351:4 **riparian** 324:23 327:9 353:10,13,21 357:14 risk 258:16,24 259:3,15,16,22 **relationship** 309:8,15,21 310:20,22 312:19 314:12 **representing** 282:21,23 260:1,3,15 262:14 278:15 316:10 represents 270:4 316:17 280:7 363:23,24 364:2,3,4,7 relative 258:16 259:15,16 334:11 347:6 351:6 354:5 364:14 **require** 332:16 337:2 River 261:6,13,20 263:16 260:15 364:7 369:20 relevant 260:1 required 297:6 298:9 307:1 269:4,15 272:12 273:18 reliability 328:15 320:5 322:4 328:2,11 274:4 275:6,8,14 277:2 reliable 276:4 308:17 328:11 330:12,22 331:23 332:5 298:23 299:6 301:3 319:1,5 333:4,21,25 334:9,12 356:5 321:2 322:20 323:13 329:4 344:18 **relied** 328:7 requirement 330:3 335:23 341:18 365:9 **relies** 343:6 requires 303:2 **Robert** 255:3,17 282:17 research 277:14 **role** 291:18,22 remained 319:22 **room** 295:5,7 309:18 367:16 remember 280:8 282:19 **RESOURCES** 254:7 283:22 286:13 355:18 367:1 respectively 332:23 rough 265:20 remembering 283:17 response 266:19,21 337:9 roughly 259:20 265:19,20,23 removal 271:3,5 284:21 348:17 361:6 321:16 324:12 removals 272:5 restricted 262:23 routinely 345:1 remove 297:8 322:10 result 267:22 268:8 275:20 **rubber** 317:18 removed 271:7,8 320:17 291:23 296:9 run 263:22 300:13

runoff 266:1,2,3,5,8,10
S
<b>S</b> 255:1 256:3,3
safe 289:3
sale 327:8
sample 276:17,19 328:25
346:19 347:5 350:7,17,22
351:5,16,17
<b>sampled</b> 328:22
samples 270:5,8,25 271:17
328:8,13,18 346:1 347:11
351:3
<b>sampling</b> 350:4 360:9,12
<b>Sanders</b> 255:17 257:19,19
367:18
satisfied 308:5
saved 325:25
saw 285:12 286:2,11 287:13
338:9 344:2 349:16
saying 261:1 275:23 307:6
311:16 321:19 336:18
337:25 340:6 349:25 350:14
361:14 363:19
says 258:11 265:16 269:12
277:23 279:7,12,18 295:18
296:9 298:15 299:12 309:7
310:7 312:9,14 319:20
324:5 330:11 331:23 334:7
340:12 343:6 347:1,13
355:25 359:12
scale 259:19,20 352:11,19
scenario 293:15
science 273:9,15 293:19
297:19 299:21 338:3 340:4
340:16
scientific 265:15 279:1
336:25 337:23 338:2 339:23
340:7 341:2 345:6 362:3,21
363:5,8,9
scientifically 302:18 307:8
310:24 323:12 325:8 335:2
340:25 360:24
scientist 280:12 284:13,15,18

298:11 299:5 300:25 302:18

```
303:24,25 335:4,6 357:23
scientists 339:1
scope 272:15 273:4 274:7
 295:4 358:19
Scott 255:10 257:12 286:25
 288:2 292:18 359:15
SEAL 369:22
second 275:9 286:20 289:8
 297:12 299:4 317:3 320:19
 342:19 347:4
SECRETARY 254:6
section 281:14,14 288:18,20
 289:19 290:10 358:7 359:2
 359:12 360:5
sections 285:12,17 286:20
see 265:21 276:10,11 279:14
 279:16 282:7 286:6,9,18,22
 288:24 290:19 304:15,18
 341:23 347:2 349:6 352:8
 352:12,16,23 353:11 354:25
 355:2 361:9,10 362:2,24
seen 300:23 311:19,23 331:1
 337:21 338:22 341:9.17
 343:10,16 357:13,23 364:23
segments 286:7
semicolon 319:24
send 346:2.19 367:20
sending 344:14 346:23 350:7
sense 281:21 284:15 285:25
 297:4 303:6 326:3,5 355:15
sentence 258:11 259:15
 278:25 295:18 298:15 303:5
 304:3 305:22 309:17,23
 313:11,13,20 315:18 316:18
 316:22 317:4 318:8 319:7
 321:19 324:5 325:22 327:3
 327:6 329:12 332:4 334:3,7
 336:17 347:4 348:13 355:25
 358:14 362:9
sentences 360:4
separate 279:13 285:17
 294:14 354:3
Sequoyah 304:15,17,21,25
 309:11 354:24 355:1,3
SERA-17 279:6
```

```
seriously 317:15
Service 303:8,14 308:4
  321:13
set 262:5 265:18 287:3 347:9
sets 288:10 343:17
seven 328:21 341:16 366:21
seven-year 343:20
Shaking 367:15
share 313:20
shared 283:15
shocking 336:2
short 292:13 296:13 327:4
  331:17 365:21
Shorthand 254:20 369:7
show 279:8 286:15 310:4
  341:20
showing 265:19 352:9
shown 352:16 354:20
sic 317:7 322:15 357:24
side 261:11,12 295:7
Sidley 282:12
sign 367:20 368:7
Signature 256:6 368:1
similar 263:10 288:10 321:6
  321:20 341:17
simple 336:15 348:22
simply 271:4 289:12 306:5
  347:7
single 260:10 350:22 351:1,5
sir 263:14 267:8 269:2,13
 271:13 277:19 278:11
 280:14,16,22 281:17 285:3
 286:24 287:18,22 291:6
 296:13 298:21 304:11
 305:23 311:24 312:13 313:7
 314:18 323:24 325:9 326:24
 334:3 341:3 352:11 355:14
  360:17 366:10,13,17
sit 288:7
site 259:17,22 264:20 265:5,6
  266:9 267:10,19 270:8
  276:22 364:6,8
sites 259:10,11 262:19 268:13
  269:19,20,21,23,24 270:14
 271:25 277:20 278:3
```

Page 160 of 166

situation 288:14 **situations** 277:10 284:5 six 275:10 333:17 size 355:11 **Slanton** 357:24 **slope** 299:23 300:3 310:20 **sloped** 299:24 **small** 350:21 snail 294:21 soil 263:21,22,23 265:3 266:2 266:3,8 267:20,21 268:21 275:20 276:7,8,9,11,12,15 276:17,20 277:21 278:7 280:12 284:13,15,17,19 285:15 287:12 291:2 293:19 297:18 298:11 299:5,21 300:25 302:18 303:24 320:9 326:20 328:7,25 335:3,6 336:20,23 337:8,8 338:3,13 340:14 343:8,11 344:3,5,19 344:21,22,24 345:3 346:1 346:19 347:22 348:15 350:22,25 351:5,12 360:10 360:12 361:5,6 362:11,14 362:21 soils 263:21 265:21 278:15 299:4.10 **soluble** 265:21 266:1,2,3,4,5 266:8,9 **sorry** 298:14 327:22 **sort** 265:7 346:5 sound 284:22,23 285:9,16,19 291:22 292:3,5 293:23 317:24 sounded 285:5 **Sounds** 268:2 source 262:12 274:22 279:2,4 279:19 315:20,21 320:7,12 321:1 322:18 325:22 335:12 336:7 365:11 sources 365:8 **South** 255:11 speak 268:24 290:2 298:14 **speaking** 272:10 277:24 289:15 303:21 359:15,22

speaks 359:13 **specific** 258:13 273:12 360:13,13 361:17 **specifically** 282:19 295:25 306:14 349:25 365:17 Specified 291:2 speculate 329:20 **spoke** 284:10 **spot** 283:16 spreadsheets 349:6 **square** 347:21 ss 369:3 stand 340:16,24 **standard** 269:16 standards 272:24 273:1 start 291:3 295:16 308:5 **started** 300:23 starting 300:22 333:12 state 254:5,8,19,22 257:8,10 262:20 263:17 265:2,12,13 265:14 267:3 268:11 320:14 327:25 343:18 345:15,16 348:1 349:22 357:9 367:4 369:3,8 statement 327:12 States 254:1 365:1,14 statistic 302:8 statistical 347:1 statistically 360:11 361:11 362:10.13 **Statistics** 303:8,13 304:8 308:4 321:13 status 360:11 362:11,15 stays 324:17 steady 271:13 steep 299:24 **steeper** 266:12 **Steinmeyer** 254:20 368:5 369:6.24 **stenograph** 369:12,12 step 296:21 297:2,5,12 298:6 298:8,10 302:23 320:4,4 333:1,20 steps 296:18 302:16 333:1 Stevenson 359:16

**stockpiled** 325:25 326:6,22 **stop** 275:16 317:10 storage 322:11 326:19,22 story 295:9 **STP** 261:13,24 271:19,25 274:1 278:14,19 290:25 295:21 296:10,11 297:6,9 298:7,9,16 301:8,10,18 302:3,7 309:2,5 311:6 320:6 320:9 326:20 327:1 328:1,3 328:4,12,16 329:1,2,23 330:1,9,10,12,23 331:24 332:4,5,9,15 333:1,4,21,22 334:1,2,10,12 335:1 336:16 339:12 347:6,21 348:3 349:5 350:24 351:6 352:17 **STPs** 272:12 273:17 275:5,20 328:6 339:15 355:5 **stream** 325:10,15,17,18,20,20 **streams** 324:23 **Street** 255:4,7 strike 299:5 329:3 **strikes** 280:11 **strokes** 272:10 students 273:8,15 274:2,8,17 315:9 **studied** 267:8 355:12 **studies** 277:14 study 262:17 318:18 323:12 341:9,10,17 345:6 364:17 **studying** 364:25 **stuff** 344:10 styled 254:17 368:6 **subfield** 260:11 subfields 260:5 **Subheading** 313:9 316:3 subject 262:18 289:5 **submitted** 343:12 361:20 **Subparagraph** 258:9 318:9 **Subpart** 342:4 subparts 262:18 **SUBSCRIBED** 368:17 **subset** 268:18,18,20 277:19 **substance** 274:10,11 281:15 **substantive** 288:6 358:10

subwatersheds 263:13 sufficiency 328:3 sufficiently 328:11 suggest 294:13 336:6 suggested 280:13 **suggestion** 305:6 336:2 suggestions 281:23 **Suite** 255:8,12 supervision 369:14 **supply** 270:11 335:1 supplying 320:7 **support** 325:1 348:7 **supposed** 258:20 **sure** 260:21 264:25 269:17 281:7 293:6 316:21 348:2 350:12 surface 273:6 **surplus** 357:10 **surprise** 336:4,5,8 357:14 surprised 300:22 survey 324:25 surveys 303:19,22,23 304:1 suspect 344:21 356:25 swear 295:9 sworn 257:22 368:17 369:9 **system** 274:23 systems 293:14 337:18  $\mathbf{T}$ T 256:3 369:1,1 take 258:4 259:17 276:17 288:12 316:23 338:1.7 346:1,19 362:4 365:18 taken 254:17 306:1 328:8,18

T 256:3 369:1,1

take 258:4 259:17 276:17

288:12 316:23 338:1,7

346:1,19 362:4 365:18

taken 254:17 306:1 328:8,18

369:18

takes 358:4

talk 280:10 294:15 298:19

348:22 354:23

talked 264:9,11 267:18 279:9

294:25 348:4 355:4 356:18

360:21,21 367:9

talking 279:11 280:4,20

285:10 313:10 329:6,10

342:20 356:3 359:3 360:5

talks 343:4

tapes 292:8 331:13 **target** 277:8 teach 273:8,11,14 274:2 315:9,11 **teaching** 364:24 team 294:11 technical 291:20 techniques 347:1 tell 258:20 279:16 282:1 288:7 290:23 292:4 293:10 295:12 300:7 303:12 310:14 316:20,21 339:7 **telling** 272:18 ten 333:17 tend 265:21 tendency 301:18 302:3,7 336:16 terms 271:14 278:4 289:15 338:13 339:15 344:13 test 265:3 267:20,22 268:21 276:9,11 277:21 278:7 284:19 337:8,8 338:13 343:11 344:3,5,22,24 347:5 347:23 348:15 350:25 351:12 361:5,6 362:11,14 362:22 tested 344:20,22 346:7 350:8 testified 257:23 testify 257:22 293:2 369:9 testimony 289:4,22 testing 276:7,8 tests 276:4,20 343:8,19 345:3 349:21 361:12 text 313:4 318:8 354:23 **Theresa** 255:6 257:16 thing 274:17 279:13 309:7 329:8 things 262:15 265:16 284:22 295:14 296:19 298:17 315:10 338:18 339:21 340:15,18,25 345:8 think 264:9 271:20 276:3 287:25 288:19 291:24 306:8 307:19 309:3,4,6 317:7,15 323:1 328:5 329:20 330:14

331:1,2 333:9,12 335:17 336:18 337:23 339:10,20 341:1 342:4 347:23,25 348:9,20 356:18 362:6 363:1,4 367:12 **thinking** 275:2 288:12 323:3 **third** 290:1 **thought** 285:19 287:12 318:5 339:6 359:14 361:16 three 264:17,23 265:1,11,16 274:22,24 298:6,11 309:9 310:4,5,14 328:19 333:1 343:17 359:18 three-year 270:20,23 threshold 264:16 265:2,3,4 265:10 267:4,11 268:14 time 257:5 275:15 276:17 282:11 286:11,16 292:12,17 314:13,14,20 315:17 319:10 321:16 322:13 326:9 328:13 331:16,21 341:15 365:20,25 366:20 367:23 369:18 times 264:17,23 265:1,11,16 275:10 291:15 295:13 338:25 351:10 title 280:4,6 290:24 295:17 today 257:5 280:21 292:23 359:19 **TOLBERT** 254:6 told 275:11 281:8 339:10 340:2,3,8 ton 306:7,11,13 320:16,23,23 tonnage 317:5 327:21 tons 277:15 303:3 305:19 306:5 310:2 316:7,8,13,22 317:1,8,9,11,21 318:4,9,12 318:14 319:8,9,14,21,23,25 321:17 322:4,6 327:18,23 330:22 331:6,25 332:7,7,16 332:17,17,22,22 333:2,3,5,7 333:14,20,22,24 334:8 356:4,10 top 309:19 321:5 330:1 **topics** 290:2 topography 263:19

total 296:21 297:5 302:23 306:25 311:25 312:1 313:21 314:10 316:3 318:12 319:9 319:22,25 320:5 321:15 324:2,4,5,7 327:16 331:23 332:7 333:2,3 touched 289:14 track 303:16 transcribed 369:13 **transcript** 368:5 369:17 transient 276:16 transitional 270:15 transport 262:12 274:22 279:3,19 325:11,13,21 **transported** 258:15 274:10 274:19 322:15 324:22 325:19 327:8 341:7 transporting 341:11 trial 289:4 tried 303:19 tries 363:24 **triple** 266:18 true 276:2 298:25 299:1 301:17 302:2,13,19 335:15 335:16,20,21,22 336:1 346:22 368:5,7 369:17 truly 309:5 trust 352:4 **TRUSTEE** 254:7 **truth** 257:22,23,23 369:10,10 369:10 try 275:13 298:14 303:16 308:7,10 314:24 317:11 331:13 351:13 363:9 364:2 trying 273:22 275:16 293:13 296:14 309:2 314:6 335:18 339:8 345:2,6 364:14 Tucker 255:14 257:14,14 282:25 **Tulsa** 254:18,19 255:5,8,12 369:4,7 turkey 306:23 355:16 turkeys 303:21 312:9,12,15 312:16,21,24,25 355:5,7,8 355:19,23

turn 258:5 268:16 **Turning** 349:3 twice 273:24 284:11 two 259:24 260:3,15 262:1,13 270:18.19.21 276:13 282:9 283:21 285:17 286:20 288:10,19,23 289:5,24 295:11 297:5 307:14 309:10 309:18 317:4 320:4,8 323:4 333:2,20 343:7,11,13 348:14 352:20 356:9 359:19 360:4 362:6 type 263:21,23 299:15,23 300:1 360:13 types 263:21 299:13,14,18 typewritten 369:14 **typical** 284:3 **typically** 306:17 **Tyson** 254:11 343:14

# <u>U</u> uh-huh 269:5 287:2 298:12

298:13 302:17 314:23 uncharacteristic 300:11 301:2 underlying 340:4 underpin 262:6 understand 260:21 264:24 266:17 268:8 270:3 272:21 274:21 284:2 288:13 295:14 306:15 307:18 318:17 328:5 334:24 337:15 338:5 339:10 340:10 351:23,24 352:2 354:2 understanding 264:25 269:11,13,17 291:11 300:13 305:13 335:25 341:5 345:22 356:13

uniform 298:19 299:10,14 300:16 uniformity 299:4 uniformly 298:22 333:23 334:2 335:10,23 356:17 unit 330:12

understood 339:5

United 254:1 365:1,14 units 316:20,21 329:5 330:2 university 273:15 274:3 315:10 327:25 343:18,19 346:23 unmet 356:20 **upfront** 338:25 usability 277:6 USDA 303:13,15 304:1 311:13 USDA's 303:7 use 260:8 261:10 262:25 264:2 265:11 267:9 276:12 281:9 285:21 310:17 315:22 323:12 325:25 337:22 345:5 348:10 351:11 362:13 363:10 **useful** 276:20,23,24 363:15 useless 277:1 uses 327:25 362:7 **usually** 277:10 338:23 **utilization** 326:9 337:7 340:18 361:5 **utilize** 362:10 utilized 299:2 utilizing 264:2

### V

valid 260:16 262:25 297:2,11 302:18 307:8 310:24 312:6 315:6 323:12,17 335:3 338:21 341:2 360:12 361:11 362:10,14 363:2 validate 325:7 validated 363:5 **validity** 339:14 **value** 259:21 301:18 302:3,9 302:14,19 307:12 309:5 310:21 338:11 349:5,15 350:18 351:6 352:9,12,16 353:19 354:5,9 **values** 337:8 349:7,8,11,16 354:20 361:6 variability 306:13 variable 276:16 300:2

variably 299:3 varying 345:4 verify 304:9,11 352:7 version 286:9,22 290:14 versus 278:16,22 299:24,24 309:16 310:18 315:20 345:12 VIDEOGRAPHER 257:3,18

292:11,16 331:15,20 365:19 365:24 367:21

VIDEOTAPED 254:14 view 276:7 307:9 339:23 350:16

virtue 254:21

Volume 254:14 257:4 370:2 **vouch** 297:17,18 303:25 319:18 331:10 333:18 358:22 vs 254:10

#### $\mathbf{W}$

W 254:4 256:3 walk 290:17 295:15 want 260:11 273:6 276:6,13 280:5 287:4 294:8,10,11 297:3 299:19 302:11 335:6 356:24 359:25 363:4 wanted 338:7 339:4 340:22 wanting 260:18,22 307:23 wants 367:19 wash 258:21 **Washington** 304:5 321:10 351:25 357:10 wasn't 300:22 308:5 342:1 366:22,23 water 261:19,25 272:11,21 272:23,25 273:1,6,19 274:4 274:15,17,19 275:7,12,21 363:16,18,21,25 364:3,9,11 364:15,20 365:2,5,6,15 waters 273:19 watershed 258:18 260:13,20 261:1,6,13,20,25 262:23 263:17 269:3,15 272:5,12 272:13,22 273:18,20 274:1

274:5,11 275:6,8,14 277:2 297:25 298:17,23 299:3,7 299:11,14 300:2,12 301:3,5 301:9,19 302:4 304:14 305:9.12 307:24 317:6 319:1,5 320:12 321:2 322:21,22 323:5,10,13 326:12 327:7 329:4,19,24 334:17 335:12,23,24 336:7 336:16 338:12 339:15 341:18 343:1,9 348:3 356:9 356:20,23 364:18,25 365:9 365:13 watersheds 260:9 262:20 263:12,13,16,17 365:10

water-holding 324:24 way 288:1 293:12 295:16 302:19 307:8 310:25 315:3 315:6,9,11 325:8 328:15 329:25 334:22 337:25 339:19,21,22 354:1 366:7,8 web 281:19 282:2,6

294:18 357:20 website 279:6,7 282:4 weigh 339:3 weight 350:12

WebEx 282:4 283:5.14

weighted 301:7,10 302:10,10 302:11 336:14 350:14,16 351:17

went 281:16 301:11,12 308:14 341:15,22

weren't 359:14 west 255:4,7 263:23 we'll 297:1 301:14,24,25 we're 264:25 280:20 285:24 292:22 293:6 296:14 306:8 310:3 313:10 328:9 331:15 337:17 342:20 356:7

we've 280:4 331:1 338:18 348:4 359:3

wide 263:4,6,9

willing 335:3 340:16,24 352:4

winter 322:11 327:5,10

witness 254:16 275:17 368:8

witnesses 367:17 wondering 267:21 wooded 324:23 327:9 word 279:21,21,22,23,25

280:12,12,13 288:8 299:15 333:13 334:4 335:17 342:16

words 292:6

369:9.22

**word-by-word** 342:1

work 263:23 291:25 294:3,13 295:16 311:19 317:21 344:25 353:25 355:13 358:23 359:7 367:7

worked 291:13 350:19 355:13

working 281:1 300:14 works 267:6

**world** 291:16 300:20,24,25 301:2 311:7 321:3 356:15 356:16

worry 308:22

worse 337:21

worthless 358:17,23 359:7 wouldn't 260:11 264:2 272:8 299:10 326:24 327:2 335:25 337:22 356:16 361:23

writing 280:2 281:21

written 312:25

wrong 311:12 347:7 wrote 281:15 361:14,19

363:6

# $\mathbf{X}$

**X** 256:1 277:15 352:19,23 353:16 354:1

### Y

**yeah** 287:13 288:23 297:17 306:9 318:6,7 320:20 329:9 330:19 355:2

year 270:18,21 276:13,21 296:23 305:16 307:12,13,13 310:10,17,18,22 315:2 318:12 356:7

years 270:18,19,21,21,22

276:14 291:14 295:11 300:14 307:3,4 310:8 312:17 314:11 316:6 328:21 328:24 343:7,22 351:10 275:15 358:7 366:22 yesterday 264:9 267:13,18 286:3,16 356:18 yield 277:12 320:10 324:8 328:2 332:6 yields 297:7 324:1,6  $\mathbf{Z}$ zero 352:20 281:5 0 **0.0058** 316:11,16 317:21 **0.0069** 316:25 318:4 **000281** 286:5 **000285** 286:17 **0058** 317:11 **09:03AM** 257:5,10 **09:04AM** 257:15,20 258:5,10 **09:05AM** 258:15,20,25 259:5 **09:06AM** 259:10,15,20,25 260:5 **09:07AM** 260:10,15,20 **09:08AM** 260:25 261:5,10,15 **09:09AM** 261:20,25 262:5 **09:10AM** 262:10,15,20,25 **09:11AM** 263:5,10,15,20 **09:12AM** 263:25 264:5,10,15 **09:13AM** 264:20,25 265:5 **09:14AM** 265:10,15,20,25 **09:15AM** 266:5,10,20 **09:16AM** 266:25 267:5,10,15 **09:17AM** 267:20,25 268:5 **09:18AM** 268:10,15 **09:19AM** 268:20,25 269:5,10 269:15 **09:20AM** 269:20,25 270:5,10 330:15 **09:21AM** 270:15,20,25 271:5 **09:22AM** 271:10,15 340:18 359:1 361:2 **09:23AM** 271:20,25 272:5 **10D** 360:2 362:9 **09:24AM** 272:10,15,20 **10E** 363:12 **09:25AM** 272:25 273:5,10,15

273:20.25 **09:26AM** 274:5,10,15 **09:27AM** 274:20,25 275:5,10 **09:28AM** 275:20.25 276:5 **09:29AM** 276:10,15,20,25 **09:30AM** 277:5,10,15 **09:31AM** 277:20,25 278:5 **09:32AM** 278:10,15,20,25 **09:33AM** 279:5,10 **09:37AM** 279:15,20,25 280:5 **09:38AM** 280:10,15,20,25 **09:39AM** 281:10,15,20,25 **09:40AM** 282:5,10,15,20 **09:41AM** 282:25 **09:42AM** 283:5,10,15 **09:43AM** 283:20,25 284:5 **09:44AM** 284:10,15,20,25 **09:45AM** 285:5,10,15 **09:46AM** 285:20,25 286:5 **09:47AM** 286:10,15,20,25 **09:48AM** 287:5 **09:49AM** 287:10,15,20 **09:50AM** 287:25 **09:51AM** 288:5,10,15 **09:52AM** 288:20.25 **09:53AM** 289:5,10 **09:54AM** 289:15,20,25 **09:55AM** 290:5 **09:56AM** 290:10,15,20 **09:57AM** 290:25 291:5,10 **09:58AM** 291:15,20,25 292:5 **09:59AM** 292:10 1 258:5 320:23 **10** 287:6 290:15 291:24 293:3 324:12,13,16 327:6 328:23 **10C** 287:20 290:9 337:4

**10,139,750** 319:23

**10:00** 292:12,13 **10:11AM** 292:15 **10:12AM** 292:20,25 293:5 **10:13** 292:14,17 10:13AM 293:10.15.20 **10:14AM** 293:25 294:5,10,15 **10:15AM** 294:20,25 295:5,10 295:15 **10:16AM** 295:20,25 296:5,10 **10:17AM** 296:15,20,25 297:5 **10:18AM** 297:10,15 **10:19AM** 297:25 298:5,10,15 **10:20AM** 298:20,25 299:5 **10:21AM** 299:10,15,20 **10:22AM** 299:25 300:5,10 **10:23AM** 300:15,20,25 301:5 **10:24AM** 301:10,15,20,25 **10:25AM** 302:5,10,15 **10:26AM** 302:20,25 303:5,10 **10:27AM** 303:15,20,25 **10:28AM** 304:5,10,15 **10:29AM** 304:20,25 305:5 **10:30AM** 305:10,15,20,25 **10:31AM** 306:5,10,15,20 **10:32AM** 306:25 307:5,10 **10:33AM** 307:15,20,25 308:5 **10:34AM** 308:10,15,20,25 **10:35AM** 309:5,10,15,20 **10:36AM** 309:25 310:5,10 **10:37AM** 310:15,20,25 **10:38AM** 311:5,10,15 **10:39AM** 311:20,25 312:5,10 **10:40AM** 312:15,20,25 **10:41AM** 313:5,10,15 **10:42AM** 313:20,25 314:5 **10:43AM** 314:10,15,20 **10:44AM** 314:25 315:5,10 **10:45AM** 315:15,20,25 **10:46AM** 316:5,10,15 **10:47AM** 316:20,25 **10:48AM** 317:5,10,15 **10:49AM** 317:20,25 **10:50AM** 318:5,10 **10:51AM** 318:15,20,25 **10:52AM** 319:5,10,15,20

**10:53AM** 319:25 **11:34AM** 341:25 342:5 **12:17** 365:22,25 **10:54AM** 320:5,10 **11:35AM** 342:10,15 **12:17PM** 366:15,20,25 367:5 **10:55AM** 320:15 **11:36AM** 342:20,25 343:5,10 **12:18PM** 367:10,15 **10:56AM** 320:20,25 321:5 **11:37AM** 343:15,20,25 344:5 **12:19PM** 367:20,25 **10:57AM** 321:10,15,20 **11:38AM** 344:10,15,20,25 **12:20** 367:23.25 **10:58AM** 321:25 322:5,10,15 345:5 **120** 328:3 330:9 332:10,11,15 334:22 347:23 353:17,19,21 **10:59AM** 322:20,25 323:5,10 **11:39AM** 345:10,15,20,25 **100** 255:7 320:10 328:2 330:3 **11:40AM** 346:5,10,15,20 354:15,17,21 332:6,12 351:6 353:12,14 **11:41AM** 346:25 347:5 **129,633** 327:18 **101** 353:11 **11:42AM** 347:10,15,20,25 **129,663** 327:23 **11** 287:15 293:3 **11:43AM** 348:5,10,15,20 **13** 268:7 278:12,14 341:21 **11,446,443** 332:16,17 **11:44AM** 348:25 349:5,10,15 342:8 359:4 **11.6** 317:23,24 **11:45AM** 349:20,25 350:5,10 **13.7** 320:17,24 **11.8** 321:17 322:6 **11:46AM** 350:15,20,25 **132,645** 330:22 331:6 **11:00AM** 323:15,20,25 324:5 **11:47AM** 351:5,10,15,20 **15** 268:16 270:25 278:16 **11:01AM** 324:10,15,20 **11:48AM** 351:25 352:5,10 328:23 330:15 **15,000** 349:12,15 350:3 352:9 **11:02AM** 324:25 325:5,10,15 **11:49AM** 352:15,20,25 353:5 **11:03AM** 325:20,25 326:5,10 **11:50AM** 353:10,15,20 **15.57** 313:16 **11:04AM** 326:15,20,25 **11:51AM** 353:25 354:5,10 **150** 268:21 277:21 278:9,15 **11:05AM** 327:5,10,15 **11:52AM** 354:15,20 278:16,19 **11:06AM** 327:20,25 328:5,10 **11:53AM** 354:25 355:5,10 **16** 277:19 278:24 332:16 **11:07AM** 328:15,20,25 **11:54AM** 355:15,20,25 **16th** 254:17 257:5 **11:08AM** 329:5,10,15 **11:55AM** 356:5,10,15 **16,850,499** 332:17 **11:09AM** 329:20,25 330:5,10 **11:56AM** 356:20,25 357:5 **16.9** 333:7,12,14,24 334:8 **17** 287:21 290:10 360:3 **11:10AM** 330:15,20,25 331:5 **11:57AM** 357:10,15,20,25 **11:11AM** 331:10,15 **11:58AM** 358:5,10 **17.88** 313:5 **1974** 296:23 297:25 298:4 **11:12** 331:16,17 **11:59AM** 358:15,20,25 359:5 **11:18AM** 331:20 303:11 307:1 312:17 314:20 359:10 **11:19AM** 331:25 332:5,10 **114** 369:16 315:2 318:13 321:6,9 **12** 258:6,10 262:5 288:17,20 331:25 333:3,6 **11:20** 331:18,21 **11:20AM** 332:15,20,25 288:24 289:5,24 290:13,18 **1985** 303:11 **11:21AM** 333:5,10,15,20 293:5,7,11 330:11 341:23 **1987** 310:11 **1992** 303:11,12 310:11 **11:22AM** 333:25 334:5 355:20 361:2 **12:00PM** 359:15,20,25 **1997** 303:12 304:5 305:4,8,11 **11:23AM** 334:10,15,20 **11:24AM** 334:25 335:5,10 **12:01PM** 360:5,10,15,20 313:13,19 314:25,25 321:10 **11:25AM** 335:15,20,25 336:5 **12:02PM** 360:25 361:5,10,15 **11:26AM** 336:10,15,20 **12:03PM** 361:20,25 362:10 **2** 268:7,17,19 277:20 309:19 **11:27AM** 336:25 337:5,10,15 **12:04PM** 362:15,20,25 363:5 316:24 318:4 **11:28AM** 337:20,25 338:5 **12:05PM** 363:10,15,20 **2.31** 313:22 **11:29AM** 338:10,15,20,25 **12:06PM** 363:25 364:5,10 **20** 329:2,2,17,22 330:2,23 **12:07PM** 364:15,20,25 339:5 331:6 332:13 334:14,18,22 **11:30AM** 339:10,15,20 **12:08PM** 365:5,10,15,20 **20th** 369:22 **11:31AM** 339:25 340:5,10,15 **12:10** 365:20,21 **2000** 255:18 343:11 **11:32AM** 340:20,25 341:5 **12:15PM** 365:25 **2002** 303:12 304:5 312:1 **11:33AM** 341:10,15,20 **12:16PM** 366:5,10

313:10,20 314:7 319:22 **370** 256:7 7 320:1 321:10 **386** 369:24 **7-11D** 258:9 **2004** 305:20 318:11 357:24 **39225** 255:19 **7.6** 313:15 **2005** 343:11 **70** 333:25 334:9,11,18 4 **2006** 343:7 **700** 255:12 **4** 277:18 278:4,15 326:10,13 **2007** 307:1 316:12 318:13 **72701** 255:15 326:14 330:1 331:22 321:6,9 333:3 343:7 **74** 311:13 4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ **2008** 332:1 **74103** 255:8,12 254:10 **2009** 254:18 257:5 368:9,18 **74119** 255:5 **40** 324:21 325:5 369:23 **75** 271:17 334:11 400 255:8 **221** 255:15 **45** 330:2 **221,114** 317:6 8 **45.5** 296:10 335:2 **225,114** 305:19 316:8 317:9 **8** 262:18 329:13 333:5 **46** 313:22 315:1 318:9 **8A** 262:4 **48** 334:1,21 **23** 332:22 333:20 **8,017,422** 318:14 **48.760.637** 313:14 **23059** 255:18 **8,453,057** 319:25 **49,350,782** 312:2 **25** 270:14 278:12 **8.8** 313:5 **491,000** 330:24 **257** 256:5 **80** 259:24 271:20,21,24 **491,246** 356:6 **26** 342:16 343:5 **81.086** 322:4 **491,276** 330:20 333:8,14 **27** 342:17 **85** 311:14 312:17 **281** 287:7 **87** 311:15 5 **283** 286:5 **5th** 255:7 9 **284** 286:5 287:7 **50** 259:25 **9** 278:25 **29** 346:25 **502** 255:4 **9,659,093** 319:9 **292** 269:14 286:18 **505,515** 332:7 **9.6** 319:14 **295,114** 305:18 316:13 **51,984,263** 312:9 **9:05** 257:2,5 318:11 319:24 **55** 270:4 **92** 311:15 **590** 261:10,17 269:12,16 3 **94** 270:1 **3** 268:17,17 278:5,22 319:10 **97** 314:7 6 319:20 321:5 **6** 271:15 278:22 328:9 351:20 **30** 349:3 352:6 353:14,21 354:6,20 **30,000-foot** 293:10 354:23 358:7 **300** 268:25 269:18 277:25 6th 255:4 348:3 **60** 306:6,7,11,17 **300-pound** 269:6 **63** 352:24 **32** 267:25 268:5 351:19 **646** 268:9 **320** 255:11 **65** 264:17 267:15,22,24 297:6 **33** 355:24 358:2 298:10 320:6,9 328:1,4 **34** 332:22 333:22 330:2,10,23 331:7,24 **343,394** 331:25 332:11,15 333:4,22,22 **347,000** 305:17 334:1,4,10,12,18 347:6,9,14 **354,000** 305:17 316:7 317:1,6 347:20 348:10,16,20 353:1 317:8 319:8,21 353:6,10 **369** 256:6